DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 914 95 EA 009 189

TITLE	Schools and Neighborhoods Research Study: The Neighborhood Survey. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Mathematica Policy Research, Seattle, Wash.; Seattle Public Schools, Wash.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 76
NOTE	249p.; Occasional tables and some pages in appendices may not reproduce legibly; For related documents see EA 009 185-189
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$12.71 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Attitudes; Community Change; Community Characteristics; *Community Surveys; Educational Quality; Elementary Education; Neighborhood Schools; Parent Attitudes; Questionnaires; Research Methodology; *School Closing; School Community Relationship; School Services; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Schools and Neighborhoods Research Project; *Seattle Washington Schools; *Washington (Seattle)

ABSTRACT

Households and businesses in neighborhoods where an elementary school had been closed and in similar neighborhoods where the school remained open were surveyed to determine community attitudes toward school closings. Respondents were asked to address a variety of questions covering such subjects as their satisfaction with their neighborhood, their perception of the quality of public elementary education in their neighborhood, their support for schools, and the extent to which the public school played a role in their decision to locate in the neighborhood. The questionnaire attempted to ascertain what people thought actually happened or expected would happen if the neighborhood school were closed and to determine what has happened to the neighborhoods where the school did close. (Author/IPT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

Prepared for: Schools and Neighborhoods
Research Project

Prepared by: Mathematica Policy Research
107 Cherry Street
Seattle, Washington 98104

August, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

I. Executive Summary of Findings 4

II. Study Design 9

III. Neighborhood Satisfaction 26

IV. Neighborhood Changes 40

V. Mobility and Locational Decisions 58

VI. Quality of Education 66

VII. Services from Schools 76

VIII. Effects of School Closure 84

IX. Support for Schools 88

X. Survey Administration 92

A. Training of Interviewers
B. Field Procedures
C. Quality Control Procedures

Appendices 110

Multivariate Analysis A1
Appendix to: Chapter III A15
Chapter IV A20
Chapter V A24
Chapter VI A27
Chapter VII A31
Chapter VIII A35
Chapter IX A39
Survey Instruments A43

INTRODUCTION[1]

During the summer of 1974, the Seattle Public Schools Administration staff presented a plan to the School Board recommending the closure of seven elementary schools. The reaction to the proposed school closures on the part of the residents in the closure neighborhoods was swift and outspoken.

Generally, the residents were opposed to the proposed school closures. They argued that the schools were an essential element in maintaining the viability of the neighborhoods and to close them would only set off a chain of events which would have negative impact on the city. Further, they argued that the school district had not studied the impact which closing the schools might have on the community.

Apparently, these arguments were persuasive, because following a summer-long series of public hearings in the proposed closure neighborhoods, the Superintendent of Schools recommended against proceeding with the closures pending further study of the closure question.

Following this decision, the School District and City of Seattle jointly applied to the National Institute of Education (NIE) for a grant to study the school closure issue. The application was successful, and in September of 1975, a staff was hired to conduct the one year study.

---

[1] A portion of this Introduction was prepared by Donald Eismann, Director of the Schools and Neighborhood Research Study.

As part of this investigation, the research design called for two separate studies to be conducted by outside consultants. The first study was designed to "determine the significance of the neighborhood school to the maintenance and/or development of the neighborhood unit." The second study, which is reported in this paper, was charged with "the identification of perceptions and expectations of neighborhood residents and businesses with respect to the schools." The Seattle Public Schools contracted with MPR to conduct this study, and the work was performed during the period of March through August 1976.

This Final Report on the Neighborhood Survey presents the findings and outlines the methodology utilized in this study. The first chapter of this report is devoted to the Executive Summary of Findings. Subsequent to this is a chapter which outlines the design of the project. This explanation is key to the understanding of the later chapters in that much of the comparative analysis presented in those chapters utilizes the distinction between control and closure neighborhoods as well as the household/business/tracked sample trichotomy. Following this there are seven chapters devoted to the more detailed discussion of the findings for each of seven research questions, which are identified in Chapter II. Each of these chapters examines in some depth the relationships between the closure of the neighborhood elementary school and changes in the surrounding communities. Although these chapters are obviously interrelated, each has been prepared as a separate set of analysis and as such the reader, having read over the chapter on study design, could easily step into the beginning of any chapter.

The final chapter (X) discusses the survey administration. Appended are copies of the survey instruments and additional tables.

CHAPTER I

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The intent of the Neighborhood Survey was to identify the perceptions and expectations of the neighborhood residents and businesses with respect to the neighborhood elementary school. More precisely, the study focused on the effects of closing that school. To accomplish this we interviewed households and businesses in neighborhoods where elementary schools had been closed as well as in other very similar neighborhoods (referred to as controls) where the school remained open. We asked respondents to address a variety of questions covering such subjects as their satisfaction with their neighborhood, their perceptions of the quality of public elementary education in their neighborhood, their support for schools, and to what extent the public schools played a role in their decision to locate in the neighborhood. We further surveyed a group of families (referred to as the tracked sample) who had children enrolled in the schools which had closed and who subsequently moved out of the neighborhood. The purpose of surveying this group was to measure the perceptions of a group which may have reacted most strongly to the closures by moving away from the neighborhood.

Although the scope of the questionnaire was fairly broad, it all pivoted around the attempt to:

1. Ascertain what people thought actually happened or expected would happen if the school was closed, and

2. Determine what has happened to the neighborhoods where the school closed vis a vis the "control" neighborhood.

As far as the first question is concerned, there was considerable data to support the hypothesis that people perceive that a school closure actually did or would cause changes in the neighborhood. For example, almost one-half of the people in the three primary "closure neighborhoods"[1] who resided there at the time of closure indicated that they thought the closure caused people to move out of the neighborhood. 40% of this same group indicate that the neighborhood residents had to find a new location for community meetings, and about the same number think that the type of people moving into the neighborhood changed. About a quarter of the matched closure group think that the closure caused the crime rate to increase, property values to decline, and people to show less concern about their neighborhoods. Causal responses such as these are quite strong; these events were not perceived as being coincidental with the closure, or part of a more general trend of changes in the neighborhood, but are seen as direct results of the closure of the school.

We asked the "control" group a similar battery of questions, but here they were worded to ask about the effect of a hypothetical closure. Almost four out of five respondents said that people would move out of the neighborhood and that the type of people moving in would change. In general, control respondents were more than twice as likely to believe that a school closure would cause changes in the neighborhood than the respondents living in the closure neighborhood at closure actually perceived as occurring.

---

[1] This group is hereafter labelled the "matched closure" group and includes Georgetown, Interlake, and Mann neighborhoods.

Also, about one out of six neighborhood residents state that they would want to move if the neighborhood school closed, and 70% of those who would want to move say they actually would move. Not surprisingly, households with children react the strongest--about one third of those saying they would want to move.

The second mode of analysis was to compare the current status and changes occurring over time in the closure neighborhoods to the status and trends in the control neighborhoods. The analysis here was more extensive, covering a broad set of subjects. On a number of these subjects there are marked differences between the closure and control neighborhoods.

Most of these differences offer support to the hypothesis that the closure of the school led to the perception of negative changes in the neighborhood. For example, businesses in the closure neighborhoods are more likely to be dissatisfied with the neighborhood as a place to do business and also more likely to think that the overall volume of business has gotten worse since the closure than do their counterparts in the control neighborhoods. The residents in the control neighborhoods are more likely to say that quality of public elementary education is excellent and improving than those in the closure neighborhoods and also, not surprisingly, they are more satisfied with the distance children have to walk to school.

The group who used to live in the closure neighborhoods and moved away around the time of closure are much more likely to think the quality of education in their new neighborhoods is good or excellent, than are the people living in their former (closure) neighborhoods. This same group is also much more likely to see the neighborhood is changing for the worse (at the time they moved) than those who stayed behind are to see a deterioration since the time of closure. This may be a very important finding; it suggests several possibilities, one of which is again that the neighborhood did experience some negative changes right after closure but that the adjustments which have taken place since that time have dampened current residents' memory of those changes.

Not all of our findings, however, support the hypothesis that neighborhood decline is associated with closure. There is virtually no closure/control difference in residents' overall satisfaction with their neighborhood, or changes in overall satisfaction since the time of closure. (Control respondents were asked about changes over the same number of years.) Closure residents also do not appear any less likely to attend meetings in the community or to have chosen their current residence because of the closeness of schools. In fact, there are several results which seem to counter this "decline" hypothesis. Both households and businesses in the control neighborhood report more crime than the closures, and control businesses are more likely to think property values are not increasing. But since the controls are overall as satisfied with their neighborhood as the closures there must be some compensating factors for the perceived higher crime rate and problem with property values. One could speculate that this compensating difference is the existence of a neighborhood school.

In conclusion, there appears to be some support for the neighborhood decline hypothesis and no consistent results countering that hypothesis. We think that the support is not consistent enough to fully accept the decline hypothesis, but that there is enough support to warrant further study of the matter. The primary weakness of the study is the length of time that elapsed between the closures and the study. It is reasonable to believe that some portion of the perceived impact has been washed away by this time lag, and only a study implemented (ideally) prior to a set of closures will truly be able to draw firm conclusions.

CHAPTER II

STUDY DESIGN

In this chapter we outline the basic parameters of this study. As such, this chapter is prerequisite to an understanding of the chapters which follow.

This chapter is presented in four sections:

A. Research Questions
B. Study Methodology
C. Sample Characteristics
D. Report Presentation

A. Research Questions

As noted above, the purpose of this study on the most general level was to identify the perceptions and expectations of neighborhood residents and businesses with respect to the schools.

To accomplish this, we delineated seven research questions, which are briefly explained below:

1. Are there differences in neighborhood satisfaction which can be attributed to the closure of the neighborhood elementary school?

   The basic hypothesis to be tested in this chapter is that the closure of the neighborhood elementary school will cause residents and businesses there to be less satisfied with the neighborhood as a place to live or do business.

2. Have there been changes in the neighborhood since the school closure which can be attributed to the closure?

   Here the hypothesis tested is that the school closure has contributed to deterioration of the neighborhood, as seen in comparison to the control neighborhood.

3. What is the importance of schools in mobility and locational decisions?

   The primary hypothesis is that the proximity to school is an important factor in locational decisions and that people would actually move out of neighborhoods because the school closed.

4. What is the perceived impact on educational quality of closing the neighborhood elementary school?

The hypothesis here is that the closure of the school caused the quality of education in the neighborhood to decline.

5. What services do residents utilize and/or expect from school facilities? Are there differences between the closures and the controls?

6. What do residents perceive actually happened or would happen if the school closed?

7. Is there a relationship between the support for schools and the closure of the neighborhood school?

The hypothesis is that residents in closure neighborhoods will show less support for the schools than those in control neighborhoods.

Given these research questions we then developed a sampling strategy and three survey questionnaires with which we conducted 1341 in-person interviews.

B. Study Methodology

This section discusses the methodology utilized to address the aforementioned research questions. This is presented in four parts:

1. Sample Construction
2. Instrument Structure
3. Survey Response
4. Limitations of Study

1. Sample Construction

Most of the analysis in the subsequent chapters is relatively unsophisticated statistically, and relies heavily upon the sample construction. As such this section is basic to the understanding of those chapters.

The basic dichotomy within the sample is the distinction between the "closure" and the "control" neighborhoods. There are five "closure" neighborhoods--each characterized by the actual or threatened closure of the neighborhood elementary school. This distinction is made for both the survey of households in the neighborhoods as well as the survey of businesses. These neighborhoods are listed in Table II-1 below.

Table II-1 SURVEY NEIGHBORHOODS BY TYPE

Closure	Control (for each Closure)
Decatur[1]	Maple Leaf
Georgetown	Concord
Interlake	Allen
Mann	Minor/Leschi
Summit	none

[1] This is a treatened closure neighborhood; the school was not actually closed.

In addition to surveying households and businesses we also surveyed a group which hereafter will be referred to as the "Tracked Sample". The sample frame for this group is composed of the parents of those children who had been enrolled in a closure school[1] and left that neighborhood either the year of closure or the following year. As in the survey of households, we often split Decatur off from the others because the closure never occurred in that neighborhood. Therefore the tracked sample results are often presented in two groups--one includes the former residents of Georgetown, Interlake, and Mann and the other of Decatur.[2]

These nine neighborhood household samples are aggregated in a variety of ways in the subsequent chapters. The different aggregations are constructed in order to best perform the various analyses required to respond to the research questions. For each of the three different aggregations we discuss below its definition, delineate its composition and sample size, and discuss the purposes for which we will utilize that group:

a. Matched Closures and Matched Controls--This is our most often used aggregation because it is the most appropriate for answering questions on the overall perceived impact of school closures. It is our opinion that the most meaningful analysis comes from this sample. There are significant differences between neighborhoods which make it difficult to control for specific neighborhood effects unrelated to school closure while sorting out the results of school closure. As the analysis is broadened to include a greater variety of neighborhoods, these neighborhood influences will not predominate as markedly.

---

[1] For purposes of constructing the tracked sample, Decatur was treated as a closure neighborhood.

[2] Summit is excluded because the closure occurred in 1965 and many of the children's addresses would not be accessible through school district records.

For these two groups we have weighted each sample point in three closure neighborhoods and their three controls according to their populations. The three closure neighborhoods used are Interlake, Mann, and Georgetown, and the controls are those matched with them: Allen, Minor/Leschi, and Concord. The reasons that these three closure neighborhoods were selected--and Decatur and Summit excluded--is that in Decatur the school never closed, and for Summit there is no control neighborhood. Also, Summit's closure occurred eleven years ago and as such a very small portion (13.7%) of our sample resided there at the time of closure.

As noted above, each of these sample points is weighted according to the neighborhood population. The formula for establishing the weight is simply the number of households in the neighborhood divided by the number of sample points. The weights utilized are as follows:

Interlake	10.421	Allen	31.013
Mann	7.460	Minor/Leschi	42.541
Georgetown	10.189	Concord	13.086

The sample sizes for these two groups in performing statistical tests are 528 matched closures and 282 matched controls.

b. Tenured Closures (or Controls) -- A relevant sub-group of each of these matched samples is the group of current residents who were living in the neighborhood at the time of the school closure. This group is referred to as "tenured" hereafter and is utilized when the analysis suggest that inclusion of all respondents might wash out some of the real impact of the closures, simply because about half of our respondents have moved into their neighborhoods since the closures. The sample size of these groups (which is weighted just as the matched groups for the analysis) are 274 tenured closures and 127 tenured controls.

c. Closures with Children -- In the analysis there is often the need to compare the tracked sample with the group of families with children who still reside in the neighborhoods where the closure occurred. The group called "Closures with Children" is defined to be those matched closure households who had children of elementary school age at the time of closure. The sample size of this group is 147, and when results are presented it is for the group weighted across the three matched closure neighborhoods.

Table II-2 below presents the sample sizes by sample group and neighborhood, and the estimated sampling error for each of these groups.

TABLE II-2: ESTIMATED SAMPLING ERROR OF VARIOUS AGGREGATIONS

Residents	Sample Size	Confidence Interval[3]
Decatur	93	± 9.8
Georgetown	89	±10.0
Interlake	235	± 6.2
Mann	204	± 6.5
Summit	95	±10.2
Maple Leaf	96	±10.0
Concord	93	±10.0
Allen	97	±10.0
Minor/Leschi	92	±10.4
Tenured Closure[1,2]	274	± 5.7
Tenured Controls[7]	127	± 8.7
Matched Closure Households	528	± 4.2
Matched Control Households	282	± 4.8
Business		
Closure[4]	111	± 7.8
Controls[4]	75	± 9.7
Tenured Closure	65	± 8.3
Tracked		
Three Neighborhoods[5]	46	±10.3
Decatur[6]	15	±15.6

---

[1] Tenured means respondents' home or business was in the neighborhood at time of closure. Non-tenured means that they were not there.

[2] This group includes the tenured residents of Georgetown, Interlake, and Mann; this is also weighted by population.

[3] All intervals are at the 95% level of confidence.

[4] Sample frame size of about 350 for closure and 250 for controls.

[5] Sample frame size of about 90.

[6] Sample frame size of about 23.

[7] Includes households in the control neighborhood that were there at the time the associated school closed.

2. Instrument Structure

The survey instruments were designed to collect the data required by the analysis plan for each of the seven research questions. These instruments are appended.

The basic approach to the questionnaire was to begin with those questions which we wished the respondent to answer before beginning to see that the questionnaire was focused on school closures. The pattern in the household questionnaire is to first discuss the neighborhood in general, leaving the definition of the neighborhood to the respondent, then pursue the neighborhood further but to define the neighborhood as only the school attendance area. The next section queries them on education in general, then education in their neighborhood, and finally questions on school closures. Demographic data collection concludes the interview. The other two interviews, tracked and business, are structured the same way.

In each table in the body of this report, the appropriate interview question number is cited.

3. Survey Results

The overall response rate for this study was 73.6%. This is about 5-8% lower than was expected, and this 5-8% can be attributed to two neighborhoods where we experienced extremely low response rates.

In Summit we encountered the problem of locked apartment buildings where contact with residents is achieved only through the intercom system. Not only does this increase the percentage "not home" it also leads to more refusals. Our resulting response rate was 50.8%. Because the Summit closure occurred eleven years ago and also because there is no control neighborhood this data was not extensively analyzed in this study.

In Minor/Leschi our response rate was only 58.2%. To attempt to analyze non-response bias we compared the demographic data on our respondents with other available data on those neighborhoods and concluded that there were no readily apparent biases present. Given the time and budget constraint of this project we decided to accept the data as useful after this cursory comparison.

Without these two neighborhoods, the response rate is 78.1%, which is about what would be expected for this type of survey.

Detail on the response rate is provided in Table II-3.

TABLE II-3 SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

HOUSEHOLD INTERVIEW

Attendance Area	Interviews Completed	Refused Interview	Could Not Contact For Interview (Not Home)	Response Rate
Decatur	93	19	5	79.5%
Georgetown	89	29	4	73.0
Interlake	235	44	26	77.0
Mann	204	43	29	73.9
Summitt	95	63	29	50.8
Allen	97	29	8	72.4
Concord	93	22	15	71.5
Maple Leaf	96	16	4	82.8
Minor-Leschi	92	41	25	58.2[1]
Totals	1094	306	145	70.8%
BUSINESS INTERVIEW				
	186	16	2	91.2%
TRACKED INTERVIEW				
	61	7	6	82.4%
TOTALS FOR ALL INTERVIEWS				
	1341	329	153	73.6%

---

[1] The response rate in Minor was 57.8%, and in Leschi 58.7%.

4. Limitations of this Study

The primary weakness of this study is that it was undertaken from five to eleven years after the fact. We feel that much of the perceived impact of the school closures has been lost because of this time lag. This is due to two reasons: 1) people adjust over time to changed circumstances, and having adjusted it is likely that many residents will not recall clearly what actually happened immediately after the change, and 2) many of the residents who may have been most affected by the event may have moved away from the neighborhood. Only about half of our sample lived in the neighborhoods at the time of closure.

We feel that this limitation is quite strong and that it probably constitutes a downward bias on the perceptions of the impact of the closure. As such we think that the impact on the neighborhood that actually occurred is at least as great as that reported here and probably greater.

As is the case in most research studies--this report suggests that there should be further work on the subject. In this case a more timely study is needed.

A second weakness of this study is the lack of a set of baseline data to be utilized to correct for control/closure differences other than the fact that the school had closed. The factor analysis utilized to assign a control to each closure, and our multivariate regression analysis are both reasonable attempts to achieve what could have been better accomplished by a set of baseline data.

C. Sample Characteristics

Since the basic focus of the analysis of this report is based upon the control/closure dichotomy it is important to examine the similarities of the control and closure neighborhoods. The Schools and Neighborhoods Research Group for the Seattle Public Schools originally assigned a control to each closure as a result of a factor analysis on a set of key demographic variables.

In Table II-4, we compare some of the basic demographic characteristics of the survey respondents of the closure neighborhoods with their control neighborhoods. In the regression analysis which appears in some of the analytical chapters it appears that the differences in demographics explain away some apparent response differences between closure and control neighborhoods.

It can be seen from Table II-4 that there are some strong differences within the closure/control neighborhood matches (e.g., Mann 46% with children vs. Minor/Leschi 33% with children). As a result the regression analysis is even more important because it controls for these differences by holding the independent variables constant at their means during the analysis.

The characteristics of the business sample are presented in Table II-5.

TABLE II-4: CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOUSEHOLD SAMPLE

Neighborhood	% with children	Age of Respondent				Ethnicity			Distance from School			Years in Residence				Follow Closure News	Household Income				Sex of Respondent Male	Own Home	n
		under 24	25-44	45-64	65+	Black	Other Min.	White	1 blk.	2 blks.	more 2 blks.	Less than 2	2-5	5-10	10+		Less than $5000	5000-10000	10000-20000	20000 +			
Decatur	35.5%	5.4%	46.2%	34.4%	14.0%	0	4.3%	95.7%	14.0%	22.6%	63.4%	21.5%	22.6%	17.2%	38.7%	66.7%	14.0%	17.2%	34.4%	34.4%	65.6%	83.9%	93
Maple Leaf	40.6	10.4	30.3	51.0	8.3	0	5.2	94.8	-5.2	18.8	78.5	17.7	17.7	18.8	45.8	66.7	12.5	12.5	31.3	43.8	72.9	89.6	96
Georgetown	27.0	11.2	28.1	32.6	28.1	1.1	9.0	89.9	6.7	2.2	91.0	37.1	12.4	13.5	37.1	51.5	47.2	18.0	30.3	4.5	52.8	48.3	89
Concord	31.5	21.7	33.7	25.0	10.9	0	0	100.0	9.8	14.1	76.1	43.5	14.1	9.8	32.6	42.4	28.3	30.4	33.7	7.6	60.9	47.8	93
Mann	45.9	10.2	35.4	40.0	14.6	83.9	6.3	10.2	6.8	20.0	73.3	74.8	9.8	15.6	45.9	53.2	44.7	23.9	25.4	6.3	62.0	61.3	204
Minor/Leschi	32.6	15.2	42.4	28.3	14.1	58.7	10.9	30.4	9.8	18.5	71.7	39.1	14.1	8.7	38.0	53.3	41.3	22.8	19.6	16.3	55.4	46.7	92
Interlake	25.1	14.9	44.7	19.6	20.9	0.4	5.1	94.5	6.0	11.1	83.0	81.7	15.7	8.5	34.9	61.7	27.2	17.9	43.4	11.5	56.6	57.9	235
Allen	17.5	19.6	37.1	28.9	14.4	1.0	2.1	96.9	7.2	18.6	74.2	37.1	16.5	10.3	36.1	49.5	18.6	19.6	44.3	17.5	54.6	67.0	97
Summit	11.6	21.1	32.6	23.2	23.2	14.7	13.7	71.6	3.2	9.5	87.4	62.1	13.7	10.5	13.7	41.5	54.7	23.2	16.8	5.3	41.4	8.4	95
ALL	30.7	14.1	37.6	30.8	17.5	22.2	6.1	71.7	7.3	15.1	77.6	36.3	14.7	12.3	36.7	54.9	32.6	20.5	32.1	14.8	58.3	53.5	1094

TABLE II-4 (continued): CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOUSEHOLD SAMPLE

	Number of Children in Household						# Households With:	
	0	1	2	3	4	5+	Children Aged 5-12 in Year of Closure	Children Less Than 5 in Year of Closure
Interlake	176 (74.9%)	23 (9.8%)	25 (10.6%)	7 (3.0%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (1.2%)	37 (15.7%)	29 (12.3%)
Allen	80 (82.5)	5 (5.2)	7 (7.2)	4 (4.1)	1 (1.0)	0	--	--
Mann	111 (54.1)	40 (19.5)	22 (10.7)	13 (6.3)	11 (5.4)	8 (4.0)	68 (33.2)	47 (22.9)
Minor/Leschi	62 (67.4)	15 (16.3)	9 (9.8)	4 (4.3)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	--	--
Georgetown	65 (73.0)	11 (12.4)	6 (6.7)	4 (4.5)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	15 (17.0)	11 (12.5)
Concord	64 (68.8)	11 (11.8)	14 (15.1)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	--	--
Decatur	60 (64.5)	17 (18.3)	12 (12.9)	4 (4.3)	0	0	16 (18.8)	17 (20.0)
Maple Leaf	57 (59.4)	17 (17.7)	17 (17.7)	3 (3.1)	0	2 (2.1)	--	--
Summit	84 (88.4)	7 (7.4)	2 (2.1)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	0	10 (11.4)	5 (5.7)

TABLE II-5: CHARACTERISTICS OF BUSINESS RESPONDENTS

		CLOSURE	CONTROL
Years Business Open	0-2...............	18 (16.2)	10 (13.8)
	3-5...............	14 (12.6)	16 (21.3)
	6-10..............	24 (21.6)	17 (22.7)
	11+...............	55 (49.6)	32 (42.7)
Respondent's Home Neighborhood	Same as Business..	22 (19.8)	16 (21.3)
	Other in Seattle....	49 (44.1)	40 (53.3)
	Other outside Seattle	40 (36.0)	19 (25.3)
Number of Employees	1.................	16 (14.4)	10 (13.3)
	2-5...............	44 (39.6)	36 (48.0)
	6-10..............	20 (18.1)	17 (22.7)
	11+...............	31 (27.9)	12 (16.0)
Gross Income	Under $20,000.....	16 (14.4)	17 (22.7)
	$20,000-$39,000...	9 (8.1)	4 (5.3)
	$40,000-$59,000...	2 (1.8)	5 (6.7)
	$60,000-$99,000...	8 (7.2)	7 (9.3)
	$100,000-$199,999	17 (15.3)	8 (10.7)
	Over $200,000.....	31 (27.9)	15 (20.0)
Distance From School	Contiguous Block...	11 (9.9)	5 (6.7)
	Next Block Away...	13 (11.7)	6 (8.0)
	Other.............	97 (87.4)	64 (85.3)

TABLE II-4 (continued): CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HOUSEHOLD SAMPLE

Current Ages of Children in Households:

	Households with one child--			Households with two children--			Households with three children--			Households with more than three children--		
	# children under 5	# children 5-12	# children 13-17	# children under 5	# children 5-12	# children 13-17	# children under 5	# children 5-12	# children 13-17	# children under 5	# children 5-12	# children 13-17
Interlake	6 (26.1%)	9 (39.1%)	8 (34.8%)	16 (32.0%)	25 (50.0%)	9 (18.0%)	4 (19.0%)	11 (52.4%)	6 (28.6%)	3 (13.6%)	16 (72.8%)	3 (13.6%)
Allen	2 (40.0)	1 (20.0)	2 (40.0)	3 (21.4)	8 (38.1)	3 (21.4)	1 (8.3)	5 (41.7)	6 (50.0)	3 (50.0)	2 (33.3)	1 (16.)
Mann	11 (27.5)	14 (35.0)	15 (37.5)	16 (36.4)	18 (40.9)	10 (22.7)	7 (7.7)	20 (51.3)	12 (30.8)	13 (14.3)	50 (54.9)	28 (30.8)
Minor-Leschi	7 (46.7)	5 (33.3)	3 (20.0)	4 (22.2)	10 (55.6)	4 (22.2)	1 (8.3)	9 (75.0)	2 (16.7)	1 (10.0)	6 (60.0)	3 (30.0)
Georgetown	5 (45.5)	3 (27.3)	3 (27.3)	4 (33.3)	7 (58.3)	1 (8.3)	2 (16.7)	4 (33.3)	6 (50.0)	4 (26.7)	10 (66.7)	1 (6.7)
Concord	6 (54.5)	3 (27.3)	2 (18.2)	10 (35.7)	15 (53.6)	3 (10.7)	3 (56.0)	1 (16.7)	2 (33.3)	3 (23.1)	6 (46.2)	4 (26.7)
Decatur	5 (29.4)	7 (41.2)	5 (29.4)	3 (12.5)	15 (62.5)	6 (25.0)	7 (58.3)	5 (41.7)	0 --	-- --	-- --	-- --
Maple Leaf	6 (35.3)	2 (11.8)	9 (52.9)	4 (11.8)	15 (44.1)	15 (44.1)	1 (11.1)	4 (44.4)	4 (44.4)	0 --	6 (54.5)	5 (45.5)
Summit	6 (85.7)	0 --	1 (14.3)	2 (50.0)	0 --	2 (50.0)	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	0 --	0 --	2 (40.0)	3 (60.0)

D. Report Presentation

As noted in the Introduction there are seven chapters (3-9) which each address one of the research questions. Each chapter begins with a brief overview, and ends with a brief summary. The tables for each chapter are presented at the end of that chapter, with additional relevant tables in the Appendix.

There are several conventions consistently utilized which should be pointed out:

1. In the analysis of proportions we report a difference as being statistically significant only if it is significant at the .1 level or better.

2. If there is a significant difference between a closure neighborhood and its control that will be reported in the text, but tables by neighborhood will typically be found in the Appendix.

3. We report the number of cases answering each question except for the matched samples. In the case of the matched samples, a weighting was used that corrected the results to reflect the views of the people living in the three closure neighborhoods as a whole and the three control neighborhoods as a whole. The weighting scheme obscures the number of observations and therefore they are not reported.

4. For the purpose of statistical tests, the number of observations equals the numbers in Table II-2 less any missing observations.

CHAPTER III

NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION

A variety of factors influence people's satisfaction with the neighborhood in which they live or conduct business. As was outlined in the previous chapter, the study design is a quasi-experimental one and for each closure neighborhood there is a control neighborhood which was so chosen because of its similarities with the closure neighborhood. In this chapter we will utilize this basic sample dichotomy to infer whether or not there are differences between residents' and businesses' satisfaction with their neighborhoods which can be attributed to the school closure.

The primary hypothesis is that the closure of the neighborhood elementary school will cause the residents and businesses therein to be less satisfied with the neighborhood as a place to live and/or do business.

Among residents there appears to be very little support for this hypothesis; in fact, more closure households report that they are very satisfied with their neighborhood. There are some notable differences between the closure, control, and tracked samples, but the key variables in explaining these differences is not the sample dichotomy, but variables such as the presence of children in the households.

Among businesses, significantly fewer closure businesses report that they are very satisfied with the neighborhood than do businesses in the control neighborhoods. This is the strongest statement in support of our primary hypothesis.

When we examine the characteristics which people think are most important in determining the quality of a neighborhood we do begin to find some interesting differences. These occur between the tracked sample and the closures who had elementary age children at the time of the closure. These two groups have children about the same age--the difference being that the tracked families have left the closure neighborhoods. A partial explanation of why they left might be that they valued the closeness to schools and the quality of schools more highly than those who stayed in the neighborhood. There are significant differences between these two sample groups which support this explanation.

The first part of this chapter discusses households, including the tracked sample, and the second part is devoted to businesses.

HOUSEHOLDS

In this section we address the following questions:

1. Are residents in the closure neighborhoods less satisfied with their neighborhood than people in the control neighborhoods?
2. In what ways are they more or less satisfied?
3. How important are the quality of schools and distance from schools in determining neighborhood satisfaction?

1. Are residents in the closure neighborhoods less satisfied with their neighborhood than people in the control neighborhoods?

In terms of overall satisfaction, people in the closure neighborhoods are as satisfied as people in the control neighborhoods. 55% of the matched closure respondents reported they were very satisfied compared to only 49.4% of the matched controls. At the other end of the scale, only 2.9% of the matched closures reported they are very dissatisfied compared to 4.4% of the matched controls.

We find a similar result when comparing the tracked sample with the closures with children. Almost half of each group report being very satisfied and the responses are very close all the way down the scale (Table III-1).

These findings offer no support to the primary hypothesis.

We then compared the respondents' satisfaction with the neighborhood depending on how far they lived from the neighborhood school. The hypothesis tested is that because closeness to schools is an important aspect of neighborhood satisfaction, the controls living closest to the school would be most satisfied. In the same vein, those persons living closest to the closure schools would now presumably have the farthest to go to schools and they would be least satisfied. The data offers no support for this hypothesis. As can be seen in Table III-7 the least satisfied group are the controls who live in the block contiguous to the public elementary school.

2. In what ways are they more or less satisfied?

The questionnaire contained questions about specific aspects of the neighborhood. These questions include the presence of helpful neighbors, what proportion of the neighbors keep up their property, neighborhood crime, and the proportion of vacant housing in the neighborhood. The only significant difference between the closures and controls is that the closure neighborhoods reported less crime; 13.9% of the closure respondents reported there was "a lot" of crime whereas 24% of the control respondents reported the same. This difference was statistically significant at the .01 level.

The closures with children are significantly more likely to report that neighbors help each other out in their neighborhood thanare the tracked sample, but these two groups are quite close on other neighborhood characteristics (Table III-2).

3. How important are the quality of schools and distance from schools in determining neighborhood satisfaction?

The most frequently mentioned characteristic for a good neighborhood is a low crime rate; over 40% of all respondents said that low crime was the most important factor in making a good neighborhood. Among matched closures and matched controls other characteristics fell into two groups: 1) helping neighbors, quality of schools, convenience to work, and convenience to transportation which were all mentioned by 8 to 10% of the respondents as being the single most important characteristic; and 2) nearness to school, nearness of parks, and having neighbors like themselves were each mentioned less than 5% of the time. The quality of schools and walking distance to schools were mentioned slightly less often by the closure respondents than the controls, but the difference was not significant.

The tracked sample was significantly different from the matched closures, matched controls, and the closures with children in several items--particularly the importance of quality schools. 27.9% of the tracked group mentioned the quality of schools as the single most important aspect of neighborhood satisfaction. This compares to only 10.3% of the closures with children, and even fewer among the matched closures and matched controls.

The respondents may not consider quality schools or walking distance from schools as the single most important aspect but still consider it to be very important. Overall the quality of schools was listed as one of the three most important items in 30% of the cases. The closure respondents mentioned it 27% of the time and control respondents mentioned it 31% of the time. (Table III-4)

Walking distance was mentioned as one of the three most important in about 13% of all cases (Table III-5).

To further this analysis multivariate regressions were performed using as dependent variables 1) the quality of education, and 2) the importance of having schools within walking distance. The purpose of this was to explain the differences between people who viewed school quality or walking distance as one of the three most important aspects of neighborhood quality and those who did not rank these items so highly. The results indicate no difference between the closure and control neighborhoods. This confirms the results reported above. However, Decatur respondents valued schools within walking distance as one of the three most important aspects over twice as frequently as the control group. This suggests that Decatur may have been sensitized by the threatened closure of their school.

The presence of children was also examined using the regression analysis, and this dramatically increased the importance of both quality and closeness of the schools as important neighborhood features. This difference is significant at the .01 level. Households with children ranked walking distance to schools as one of the three most important 28.0% of the time as opposed to 7.3% among those without children. And 51.6% of those households with children view school quality as one of the three most important aspects of neighborhood quality as opposed to 20.5% for households without children. The last set of regression analysis was aimed at determining what the effect of the respondent's distance from the school under study would have on their likelihood to consider school quality or distance as important features of the neighborhood. No such differences were found.

The results of these regressions are presented in Tables III-4 and 5.

BUSINESSES

1. Are closure businesses less satisfied with their neighborhoods than control businesses?

Control businesses report they are very satisfied significantly more often than closure businesses. 61% of the control businesses were very satisfied while only 49% of closure businesses reported that they were very satisfied. However, at the other end of the scale this distinction does not hold true; about the same percentage of each group is very dissatisfied with the neighborhood as a place to do business (Table III-1).

2. Neighborhood characteristics

Businesses were asked about crime in the neighborhoods and to what extent homes in the neighborhood were kept up. Closure businesses were significantly less likely to report a lot of crime than control businesses. Only 19.4% of the closure businesses reported "a lot" of crime compared to 32.4% among the controls. This is the same result discovered among neighborhood residents reported above. There is no significant difference between the perceptions of whether or not neighborhood residents keep up their property.

SUMMARY

There does appear to be some support for the primary hypothesis of this chapter-- the control businesses were significantly more likely to report that they are very satisfied with their neighborhood than the closure businesses. However, when looking at neighborhood residents there is apparently no such difference--the closures and controls report virtually the same level of neighborhood satisfaction.

When looking at specific aspects of neighborhood satisfaction the most notable finding is that both the households and the businesses in the control neighborhoods report a perception of more crime than in the closure neighborhoods. Further we find that the crime rate is by far the most important single aspect of neighborhood satisfaction. These findings leave the issue somewhat unsettled--if crime is as important to people as the data suggests, and there is actually much more of it in the control neighborhoods, then what are the compensating strengths in these neighborhoods such that the controls are at least as satisfied with their neighborhoods as the closures are with theirs. If we could assume that the closure/control matches were very good then one could conclude that the compensating difference is that there is a neighborhood school in the control neighborhood. We would not go so far with the data at hand, but would suggest this as a possibility worth further examination.

TABLE III-1: OVERALL CURRENT NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION[2]

	HOUSEHOLD		BUSINESS		TRACKED	CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN
	MATCHED CLOSURE	MATCHED CONTROL	CLOSURE	CONTROL		
VERY SATISFIED	55.4%	49.4%	49.4%[1]	61.1%[1]	45.9%	48.3%
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	34.3	38.6	42.0	29.2	39.3	39.1
SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED	7.3	7.5	8.6	6.9	9.8	8.7
VERY DISSATISFIED	2.9	4.4	0	2.8	4.9	3.9
			(n=111)	(n=75)	(n=61)	(n=147)

[1] Difference between closure and control businesses statistically significant at the .05 level (T=2.14)

[2] Household question 9; Business question 4; Tracked question 8.

TABLE III-2: SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION

	HOUSEHOLDS		TRACKED	CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN	BUSINESSES	
	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS			CLOSURES	CONTROLS
Do neighbors help each other out?						
YES	78.7%	74.7%	61.1%	80.7%	X	X
NO	21.3	25.3	38.9	19.3		
			(n=54)	(n=127)		
How often do crimes occur?						
A LOT	13.9[1]	24.0[1]	16.1	14.2	19.4[2]	32.4[2]
SOME	37.4	36.2	26.8	39.4	51.4	47.9
A LITTLE	48.8	39.8	57.1	46.3	25.0	19.8
NONE	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	4.2	-0-
			(n=56)	(n=132)	(n=99)	(n=72)
How many people keep up their property?						
MOST	66.0	68.2	68.3	62.6	62.5	56.0
SOME	23.1	24.7	20.0	30.9	25.0	36.3
FEW	10.9	7.1	11.7	6.5	12.5	7.5
			(n=60)	(n=137)	(n=98)	(n=68)
How many vacant houses?						
A LOT	7.3	7.9	5.1	9.4		
SOME	11.0	11.4	5.1	11.5		
A FEW	47.3	50.4	50.8	56.2		
NONE	34.5	30.3	39.0	22.9		
			(n=59)	(n=143)		

[1] Matched Closures and Matched Control difference significant at .01 level (T=3.5)

[2] Closure and Control businesses difference significant at .02 level (T=2.54)

[3] Household question 11, 13-14; Tracked 23-26;

[4] In this question the time frame of reference for the households and businesses is the present; for the tracked, it is when they moved away from the closure neighborhood.

TABLE III-3: SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECT OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION[2]

	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS	TRACKED	CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN
Convenience to Shopping	11.3%	7.3%	4.9%	3.7%
Low Crime Rate	42.5	45.1	37.7	47.9
Helpful Neighbors	12.4	8.9	4.9	13.6
Quality of Schools	7.4	8.9	27.9[1]	10.3[1]
Convenience to Work	8.3	7.9	3.3	6.6
Neighbors Similar to Yourself	2.3	2.5	1.6	0.7
Within Walking Distance to Schools	2.5	2.8	8.2	5.3
Convenience to Public Transportation	8.7	11.5	9.8	7.8
Convenience to Parks and Recreation Areas	3.6	5.1	1.6	2.0
			(n=61)	(n=147)

---

[1] Tracked sample significantly different from Closures with Children at .001 (T=3.5).

[2] Household question 8, Tracked question 7.

TABLE III-4

PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE WHO CONSIDER SCHOOL QUALITY AS ONE OF THE 3 MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF A GOOD NEIGHBORHOOD [2,3]

	TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD			PRESENCE OF CHILDREN 5 - 12		DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL			OVERALL
	CLOSURE	CONTROL	DECATUR	HSHLDS w/ CHILDREN	HSHLDS w/o CHILDREN	ONE BLOCK	TWO BLOCKS	MORE THAN 2 BLOCKS	
Percentage	28.5%	32.2%	37.9%	52.0% [1]	20.3% [1]	24.4%	23.8%	30.6%	30.11%
(Number of cases)	(592)	(364)	(87)	(323)	(720)	(77)	(155)	(811)	(1043)

---

[1] The difference in perception of school quality between people with and without children is statistically significant at the .01 level.

[2] Adjusted by regression to hold constant the effects of whether the respondent was present at closure, the type of neighborhood, the age of the respondent, the sex of the respondent, the ethnicity of the respondent, the distance from the school, the years in this residence, whether the respondent followed the news about the new closures or not, income, whether the respondent owned his or her home, and whether the family included children or not, except the variables listed in the table. In other words, all variables are held constant at their mean except the one under study (e.g., presence of children, distance from school, etc.)

[3] The dependent variable assumes the value of "1" if the respondent mentioned school quality as one of the three most important aspects of neighborhood quality. (Regression #3)

TABLE III-5: PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE WHO CONSIDER HAVING A SCHOOL NEARBY AS ONE OF THE 3 MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF A GOOD NEIGHBORHOOD[3,4]

	TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD			PRESENCE OF CHILDREN 5 - 12		DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL			OVERALL
	CLOSURE	CONTROL	DECATUR	CHILDREN	NO CHILDREN	ONE BLOCK	TWO BLOCKS	MORE THAN 2 BLOCKS	
Percentage	13.0%	13.5%[1]	26.4%[1]	27.3%[2]	7.10%[2]	13.3%	14.6%	13.3%	13.3%
(Number of	(592)	(364)	(87)	(323)	(720)	(77)	(155)	(811)	(1043)

[1] The difference between Decatur and the control neighborhoods is significant at the .01 level.

[2] The difference between families with or without children is significant at the .01 level.

[3] Adjusted by regression to hold constant the effects of whether the respondent was present at closure, the type of neighborhood, the age of the respondent, the sex of the respondent, the ethnicity of the respondent, the distance from the school, the years in this residence, whether the respondent followed the news about the new closures or not, income, whether the respondent owned his or her home, and whether the family included children or not, except the variables listed in the table. In other words, all variables are held constant at their mean except the one under study (e.g., presence of children, distance from school, etc.)

[4] The dependent variable assumes the value "1" if the respondent mentioned having a school within walking distance as one of the three most important aspects of neighborhood quality. (Regression #4)

TABLE III-6:

IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOLS AS DETERMINANT OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION[2]

(Tracked Sample and Closures with Children)

	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ONE OF THREE MOST IMPORTANT	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT[1]
Quality of Schools					
TRACKED	1.6%	11.5%	21.3%	65.6%[3]	27.9%
CLOSURES w/ CHILDREN	8.5	18.6	29.2	43.7[3]	10.2
Schools within Walking Distance					
TRACKED	11.5%	19.7%	26.2%	42.6%[3]	8.2%
CLOSURES w/ CHILDREN	25.7	29.1	30.0	15.2[3]	5.3

[1] This percentage is included in the "One of Three Most Important" columns. Therefore, excluding this "Single Most Important" column the rows should total 100%.

[2] Household question 6, Tracked question 5.

[3] Difference significant at .01 (T=5.2)

TABLE III-7: NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION BY DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL[2]

	Distance from School[1]			
	1	2	3	
ALL CLOSURES				
Very Satisfied	48.6%	43.6%	53.3%	
Somewhat Satisfied	37.8	41.0	36.2	n=623
Somewhat Dissatisfied	10.8	11.5	6.9	
Very Dissatisfied	2.7	3.8	3.5	
ALL CONTROLS				
Very Satisfied	40.0	54.5	55.0	
Somewhat Satisfied	43.3	27.3	35.5	n=378
Somewhat Dissatisfied	13.3	9.1	6.7	
Very Dissatisfied	3.3	9.1	2.8	

[1] Distance = 1 if family lives in block contiguous to elementary school (closure school in the case of closure neighborhoods); = 2 if they live in the next ring surrounding the school; = 3 otherwise.

[2] Household question

CHAPTER IV

NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGES

Neighborhoods change for a variety of reasons. One possible cause of change could be the closure of the neighborhood elementary school. In this chapter we utilize the closure/control dichotomy to examine whether the school closure has contributed to deterioration or improvement in the closure neighborhoods when compared to the controls.

The hypothesis is that the closure of the neighborhood school would cause residents of closure neighborhoods to be less satisfied with their neighborhoods than the controls. When comparing the closures with the controls there is no support for this hypothesis. However, evidence from the tracked sample suggests that there may have been some changes in neighborhood satisfaction immediately after closure which are not now apparent.

When examining businesses there are differences between the closures and controls. Significantly more tenured closure businesses think that the volume of business in the neighborhood has gotten worse than is the case among the tenured control businesses.

This chapter is divided into two sections. We first discuss households and the tracked sample, and then the businesses.

HOUSEHOLDS

In this section we will address these questions:

1. Do people in the closure neighborhoods feel conditions have gotten worse since the school closure? What trends did the tracked sample perceive in the neighborhoods when they moved away?

2. How have things gotten worse?

3. How has the neighborhood changed?

4. Using multivariate analysis, what variables explain overall changes in the respondents' perceptions of the neighborhood as place to live?

1. Do people in the closure neighborhoods feel conditions have gotten worse since the school closure? What trends did the tracked sample perceive in the neighborhood when they moved away?

Overall, about 20.5% of the respondents in the matched neighborhoods report that the neighborhood in general had become a worse place to live. Slighly more control respondents reported that things had gotten worse, but the difference is not significant (Table IV-1).

We then disaggregated the closure sample and examined the response of the closures with children. As can be seen in Table IV-1, this sample group perceived more positive change in their neighborhood than the remainder of the matched closures. In fact the difference between the response of closures with children and the response of closures without children[1] is significant at the .001 level.

---

[1] This is the matched closure sample less the closures with children.

Only 9.2% of the people in Georgetown report things have gotten better compared to 31.9% of the people in Concord. This is a significant difference at the .001 level. Other than this, there are no statistically significant differences between the closures and controls.

People in the tracked sample were asked to assess how their former neighborhood was changing when they moved away. One hypothesis would be that the people that left would be more likely to think it was changing for the worse than the people that remained. Although we have a small number of respondents and the difference therefore may not be significant, all four of the neighborhoods that were used for the tracked sample were more often regarded as getting worse by the tracked sample than by the people who remained in these neighborhoods. The most dramatic difference is in Interlake where 55% of the people in the tracked sample felt things had gotten worse compared to 11.2% for the people who remained. However, these differences are tempered somewhat by the fact that the tracked sample was asked to respond about how the neighborhood was changing when they moved away, which was right about the time of closure. On the other hand, the household sample was asked about the period of time from year of closure to present. Presumably, the impact of closure has softened over time so that the two groups should not be directly compared. However, it follows that if there has been a softening of the impact, the views of the tracked sample may be more truly representative of the effects of school closure.

These tracked results are presented in Table IV-2.

2. How have things become worse?

The questionnaire asked the household respondents about how the neighborhood had changed with respect to the degree to which neighbors helped each other, property values, the level of upkeep on the homes in the neighborhood, crime, and the number of vacant houses. With respect to all these items, the closure and control samples were remarkably close except for crime, where significantly more of the control respondents reported that crime had increased. It should be mentioned that more control respondents reported that crime decreased also.

This result parallels the results reported in the previous chapter--that the controls perceive more crime in their neighborhoods than that reported by closures. Again, parallel to the previous analysis, there is no appreciable difference between the controls and closures as far as their perception of overall changes in the neighborhood. So if crime has increased more in those neighborhoods then there must be something good happening to compensate for this and it is quite possible that the "good" is that there is a neighborhood school.

3. How has the neighborhood changed?

The questionnaire contained an open ended question that allowed the respondents to report any changes they observed. Because the question was open ended, the number of people reporting a particular change tended to be small; however, the importance of the change to the respondent reporting it is probably significant.

A main change that might be expected as a result of a school closure is that families with children would leave the neighborhood. This was not what was reported; of the 29 people in the closure neighborhoods that reported a change in the number of children, 17 reported that the number of children increased. Other changes that were reported across all neighborhoods were a decline in the age of the residents particularly in Interlake and Allen, an increase in minorities, a decline in owner-occupied dwellings, an increase in commercial use particularly in Georgetown and Concord, and an increase in multi-family use. In none of these changes were closure/control differences apparent. Tables on this material can be found in the Appendix.

4. Using multivariate analysis, what variables explain overall changes in perceptions of the neighborhood as a place to live?

Multivariate analysis can be utilized to determine the key factors associated with perceiving changes in the neighborhood. To accomplish this analysis we assigned the value "1" to responses that the neighborhood had become a worse place to live since the year of closure, and "0" to any other response. We then utilized this as the dependent variable, and regressed the set of independent variables described in the appendix on this variable. When assessing the impact of any one independent variable we hold the other independent variables constant at their means.

As can be seen in Table IV-4 (which has been adjusted by the regression equation for which detail is reported in the appendix) there is no difference between the closures and controls, nor does the presence of children have an influence (Table IV-4).

BUSINESS

The business community in the neighborhood of the closure schools could have been affected in a number of ways by the closure. They could have been affected directly by a loss in business from school children that patronized their business. Indirectly they may have lost business because of the out migration of families leaving the neighborhood or their property may have lost value from higher vacancy rates. Crime may have increased as a part of general neighborhood decline.

In this section we will address the following questions:

1. Do business people in closure neighborhoods vis a vis the control neighborhoods think that business has gotten worse?
2. Do respondents think that the volume of business has declined in closure neighborhoods when compared to the control neighborhoods?
3. Do they think more businesses failed in the closure neighborhoods?
4. Are there other changes in specific aspects of neighborhood quality?
5. What other changes in the neighborhood have the business people observed? Do they perceive that these changes were caused by the closure of the school?

For the most part our comparisons utilized the matched closure business versus the matched control businesses.

1. Do the business people in the closure neighborhoods vis a vis the control neighborhoods think that business has gotten worse?

There is no difference between the closure and control neighborhoods in the proportion of business people reporting that the neighborhood is a worse place to do business. 22% of the business respondents in both the control and closure neighborhoods reported that their neighborhoods have become a worse place to do business (Table IV-5).

53.8% of the businesses in the Mann area thought that the neighborhood was a worse place to do business, a proportion significantly greater than the 25.0% in the Minor/Leschi area, the control neighborhood for Mann.[1]

2. Do respondents think that the volume of business has declined in the closure neighborhoods?

About 20% of both the matched closure and matched control businesses indicated that they personally had experienced a decline in business (Table IV-6). However, in a separate question 21% of the tenured closures indicated that the volume of business in their neighborhood declined since the year of closure compared to only about 10% among the tenured controls. This difference is statistically significant at the .1 level (Table IV-7).

27.6% of the businesses in the Interlake neighborhood reported a decline in business while only 8.3% of the Allen businesses reported a decline. This difference was significant at the .01 level.

Over 40% of the Mann businesses reported a decline in volume compared to 26% of the Minor/Leschi businesses. This difference was large but not statistically significant.[2]

3. Did more businesses fail in the closure neighborhoods?

The failure of businesses is quite common. Over 70% of all business respondents indicated that at least one business had failed in the neighborhood since the year the school closed. There is no apparent difference between closures and controls. (Table IV-8).

---

[1] Significant at .02 level (T=2.55)

[2] T=1.25

4. Are there other changes in specific aspects of neighborhood quality?

Business respondents were asked to assess change in several specific aspects of the neighborhood. Here we find some significant although puzzling closure/control differences.

More businesses in the matched control sample reported that property values are declining than businesses in the matched closure neighborhoods; 47.5% of the control business and 33.8% of the closure business reported that property values are declining. This difference is significant at the .05 level. Yet on the other hand 25.4% of the matched closure businesses report that property upkeep in their neighborhood has gotten worse since the year of closure, compared to 14.0% among the matched controls. This difference is also significant at .05 (Table IV-9).

5. What other changes in the neighborhood have people in business observed?

Each business respondent was asked an open-ended question about other changes in the neighborhood. 9% indicated that the proportion of owner occupied dwellings declined. 14.8% of the closure businesses made such a response, compared to 8.5% of the controls.

28% of the closure and 15.2% of the control neighborhood businesses thought the neighborhood had become more commercial. This difference is significant at the .05 level of confidence; however, the aggregation disguises the fact that 19 out of the 23 business respondents in the closure neighborhoods that said the neighborhood had become more commercial were from Georgetown. The Concord neighborhood had a similar proportion of respondents who indicated increased commercialization (over 70%), but fewer business respondents so that they did not dominate the results.

SUMMARY

In summary there is no consistent support for the neighborhood decline hypothesis. On most of the questioning the controls and closures answered very closely. The responses among the tracked sample to what was happening in the closure neighborhoods at the time of closure suggest that there may have been an impact at the time of closure, the perception of which has become dampened with time.

A rather surprising result is that the closures with children are more pleased with the trends in the closure neighborhoods than the closure residents who did not have elementary age children at the time of closure.

TABLE IV-1: OVERALL CHANGE IN NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE [4]

	NEIGHBORHOOD IMPROVED	STAYED THE SAME	GOTTEN WORSE	
Matched Closure	24.1%	57.0%	18.9%	
Matched Control	25.7	52.8	21.5	
Closures with Children	37.1[3]	46.1	16.9	(n=147)
Closures w/out Children[2]	21.1[3]	59.6	19.4	(n=381)
By Neighborhood				
Decatur	21.5	75.3	3.2	(n=93)
Maple Leaf	19.8	69.8	10.4	(n=96)
Georgetown	9.2[1]	57.5	33.3	(n=87)
Concord	31.9[1]	50.5	17.6	(n=91)
Interlake	23.6	65.2	11.2	(n=233)
Allen	14.6	63.5	21.9	(n=96)
Mann	33.7	43.6	22.8	(n=202)
Minor/Leschi	32.6	44.9	22.5	(n=89)
Summit	22.2	57.8	20.0	(n=90)

---

[1] Difference is statistically significant at .001 level (T=4.09)

[2] This group is the matched closure sample less the closures with children.

[3] Difference is significant at .001 level (T=3.84)

[4] Interview question number 10.

TABLE IV-2: WHAT WAS HAPPENING TO CLOSURE NEIGHBORHOOD AS A PLACE TO LIVE WHEN RESPONDENT MOVED AWAY?[2]

TRACKED NEIGHBORHOOD [1]	IMPROVING	STAYING THE SAME	GETTING WORSE	
DECATUR	26.7%	60.6%	13.3%	(n=15)
GEORGETOWN	25.0	33.3	41.7	(n=13)
INTERLAKE	18.2	27.3	54.5	(n=14)
MANN	41.2	17.6	41.2	(n=19)

[1] It should be noted that the tracked sample was not designed to be disaggregated this far and thus the sampling error is greater than we find normally acceptable. Therefore this table should be regarded as suggestive and no inferences can be drawn from it.

[2] Tracked question #22.

TABLE IV-3: PERCEIVED CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE[3]

	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS
Neighbors helping each other out:		
MORE	26.2 %	28.3%
SAME	59.7	58.0
LESS	14.1	13.7
Property values changed compared to the city as a whole:		
BETTER	10.9[1]	15.6[1]
SAME RATE	36.0	36.3
WORSE	52.8	48.1
Property upkeep:		
BETTER	30.2	29.9
SAME	50.5	52.2
WORSE	19.3	17.9
Crime Rate:		
HIGHER	25.3[2]	30.3[2]
SAME	55.4	42.0
LOWER	19.3	27.7
Number of Vacant Houses		
MORE	20.4	23.6
SAME	41.5	40.3
LESS	38.1	36.1

[1] Closure/Control difference significant at .1 (T=1.84)

[2] T=1.55

[3] Interview question number 16, 17, 23-25.

TABLE IV-4

PERCENTAGE OF PEOPLE REPORTING THAT THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS WORSE[2,3]

	TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD			PRESENCE OF CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD	
	CLOSURE	CONTROL	DECATUR	CHILDREN	NO CHILDREN
Percentage	17.0%	16.5%[1]	2.7%[1]	18.0%	16.2%
(Number of Cases	(592)	(364)	(87)	(323)	(720)

[1] The difference between the Decatur and control neighborhoods is statistically significant at the .01 level, but this is quite possibly more related to general neighborhood conditions and it would be difficult to attribute it to the threatened closure.

[2] Adjusted by regression to hold constant the effects of whether the respondent was present at closure, the type of neighborhood, the age of the respondent, the sex of the respondent, the ethnicity of the respondent, the distance from the school, the years in this residence, whether the respondent followed the news about the new closures or not, income, whether the respondent owned his or her home, and whether the family included children or not except the variables listed in the table. In other words, all variables are held constant at their mean except the one under study (e.g., presence of children, distance from school, etc.)

[3] The dependent variable was "1" if the respondent stated that overall the neighborhood is a worse place to live. Otherwise its value was "0". The independent variables are a set of demographic characteristics.

TABLE IV-5: OVERALL WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO THIS NEIGHBORHOOD AS A PLACE TO DO BUSINESS SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE? [1]

	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	DON'T KNOW	
MATCHED CLOSURE BUSINESSES	40.7%	30.9%	22.2%	6.1%	(n=105)
MATCHED CONTROL BUSINESSES	44.4	30.5	22.2	2.7	(n=73)

---

[1] Business question 5.

TABLE IV-6: HAS YOUR VOLUME OF BUSINESS INCREASED, STAYED THE SAME OR DECREASED SINCE THE YEAR OF CLOSURE? [1]

	MORE	SAME	LESS	
MATCHED CLOSURE BUSINESSES	63.1%	15.4%	21.5%	(n=65)
MATCHED CONTROL BUSINESSES	62.5%	20.3%	17.2%	(n=64)

---

[1] Business question 12.

TABLE IV-7: HOW HAS THE OVERALL VOLUME OF BUSINESS CHANGED SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE? [2]

	INCREASED	SAME	DECREASED	
TENURED CLOSURE BUSINESSES	60.4%	18.9%	20.8% [1]	(n=53)
TENURED CONTROL BUSINESSES	65.0	25.0	10.0 [1]	(n=40)

---

[1] Difference significant at .1 level.
[2] Business question 21.

TABLE IV-8: HAVE ANY NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESSES FAILED SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE?[1]

	YES	NO	
MATCHED CLOSURE BUSINESSES	73.5%	26.5%	(n=49)
MATCHED CONTROLS BUSINESSES	73.9	26.1	(n=46)

---

[1] Business question 18.

72

TABLE IV-9: CHANGES PERCEIVED IN NEIGHBORHOOD BY BUSINESS RESPONDENTS SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE [1]

	MATCHED CLOSURE BUSINESSES	MATCHED CONTROL BUSINESSES
Property values changed compared to city as a whole:		
BETTER	19.1	11.5
SAME	47.1	41.0
WORSE	33.8[2]	47.5[2]
	(n=68)	(n=61)
Property upkeep:		
BETTER	33.9	35.1
SAME	40.7	50.9
WORSE	25.4[3]	14.0[3]
	(n=59)	(n=57)

---

[1] Business questions 7, 8 and 10.
[2] Closure / Control difference significant at .05 (T=2.28)
[3] Closure / Control difference significant at .05 (T=2.25)

CHAPTER V

MOBILITY AND LOCATIONAL DECISIONS

A variety of factors usually influence people's locational choices. Other studies have indicated that among other factors housing structure, proximity to relatives, and convenience to amenities play important roles in these decisions. This chapter addresses the question, to what extent does the proximity of schools, most specifically the neighborhood elementary school, affect locational decisions? We also address the importance of school quality as a factor in locational decisions. Our interest here is not only among current neighborhood residents but also the businesses and persons in the tracked sample.

Briefly, almost no one left their previous location primarily because of the proximity to schools, and about one out of ten state that the primary reason for choosing their current location is the proximity to the school. Also, about one out of ten state that they actually would move if their neighborhood elementary school closed.

This chapter is presented in three sections, addressing these three general areas:

1. Why respondents left their previous location,
2. Why they chose their current location,
3. What would be their response to an elementary school closure or decline in educational quality.

1. Why respondents left their previous location.

When queried in an open ended question as to the reasons for departing from their previous home virtually no one (about 1%) mentioned the quality of schools or the distance from schools. The percentage is too small to even attempt a comparison between control and closure neighborhood respondents.

Among the tracked sample, 6% noted that "schools" were the primary reason they moved away from the closure neighborhoods. This compares to 30% who moved because of the housing structure, with the rest of the sample spread widely across a variety of other reasons.

2. Why respondents chose current neighborhood.

A surprising result is that 12.2% of the matched closure neighborhood residents mention closeness of schools as a reason for choosing their current residence as opposed to only 8.7% in the matched control neighborhoods. However, this difference is not statistically significant.

As expected, people were more likely to mention closeness of schools as a reason if they had children. For example, 18.0% of the tenured closures with children mentioned closeness of schools as did 16.4% of the tracked sample.

It can be seen from Table V-1 that there is no support for the hypothesis that tenured closure respondents would be more likely to have moved to the neighborhood because of the proximity to the school than the rest of the closure sample.

As can be seen in Table V-1 below, the Georgetown-Interlake-Mann tracked group is similar to closure and control neighborhood households, but the Decatur tracked group is more prone to mention closeness of schools.

No businesses mentioned closeness to schools as a reason for locating where they did; 49.4% of the businesses state that they chose their current location because they "found the right place and/or right price". One might presume that proximity to schools was a factor in some percentage of these decisions.

School quality does not appear to be important in this analysis--where less than 2% of the closures and controls cite school quality as a reason for their current location.

3. What would be their response to the elementary school closure or decline in educational quality?

We queried respondents as to whether or not they would want to move if any of a number of changes occurred in their neighborhood. The changes we were interested in examining were the closure of the elementary school and/or a decline in school quality. If the respondent indicated they would want to move if either of these two occurred we asked them a followup question--would they actually move if that change occurred?

There are no significant differences between the way the matched closures or matched controls state they would respond locationally to the closure of the elementary school or the decline in educational quality. However, there is a noticeable response in each group where about 16% state that they would want to move if the school closed, and of those about 69% state that they would actually move (Table V-2). More persons would want to move if educational quality declined, but a smaller percentage would actually move (Table V-3). Using multi-variate analysis we note that there is a significant difference (.01 level) between households with children and those without children.[1] Using a "yes" response to wanting to move if the school closed as the dependent variable we find that 33.8% of the households with children would want to move as opposed to 8.0% of the families without children (Table V-4). This is carried through with a significant difference between households with children and those without on the questions of whether or not they would actually move if the school closed (Table V-5).

In summary, there is virtually no difference between closures and controls as far as locational decisions, but the presence of children in the household does exert an effect.

---

[1] The sample used in this analysis was the combined matched closure and matched control.

TABLE V-1: REASONS FOR SELECTING CURRENT NEIGHBORHOOD

(By percentages)

	Closeness of Schools	Quality of Schools
Matched Closure Households	12.2%	1.9%
Matched Control Households	8.7%	1.1%
Tenured Closure Households	10.0%	1.3%
Decatur Tracked	26.7%	13.3%
Geo-Int-Mann Tracked	13.0%	6.1%
Tenured Closures w/ Children	18.0% [1]	3.3%

---

[1] Statistically significant difference between tenured closures without children where 10.8% listed closeness of schools as a reason as opposed to 18% of the tenured closures with children. (T=2.16, significant at .05)

TABLE V-2: WANT TO/ACTUALLY MOVE IF SCHOOL CLOSED

	% Would Want To Move	Of those-- % Would Actually Move
Matched Closures	17.6	67.1
Matched Controls	15.0	71.3

TABLE V-3: WANT TO/ACTUALLY MOVE IF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY DECLINED

	% Would Want To Move	Of those-- % Would Actually Move
Matched Closures	24.4	55.8
Matched Controls	23.2	63.8

TABLE V-4: WANT TO MOVE IF THE SCHOOL CLOSED[2,3]

	TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD			PRESENCE OF CHILDREN		DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL			OVERALL
	CLOSURE	CONTROL	DECATUR	CHILDREN	NO CHILDREN	ONE BLOCK	TWO BLOCKS	MORE THAN 2 BLOCKS	
Percentage	16.6%	15.2%	20.9%	34.2%[1]	7.8%[1]	22.9%	16.7%	16.5%	16.0%
(Number of	(592)	(364)	(87)	(323)	(720)	(77)	(155)	(811)	(1043)

[1] Difference between families with children and no children is statistically significant at the .01 level.

[2] Adjusted by regression to hold constant the affects of whether the respondent was present at closure, the type of neighborhood, the age of the respondent, the sex of the respondent, the ethnicity of the respondent, the distance from the school, the years in this residence, whether the respondent followed the news about the new closures or not, income, whether the respondent owned his or her home, and whether the family included children or not except the variable listed at the top of the main headings. In other words--all variables are held constant at their mean except the one under study (e.g. presence of children, distance from school, etc.).

[3] The dependent variable is "1" if respondent answers "yes" to the question would you want to move if the neighborhood elementary school closed. The independent variables use the same demographic variables used in all other regression analysis. Regression #5.

TABLE V-5: ACTUALLY MOVE IF THE SCHOOL CLOSED[2,3,4]

	TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD			PRESENCE OF CHILDREN		DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL			OVERALL
	CLOSURE	CONTROL	DECATUR	CHILDREN	NO CHILDREN	ONE BLOCK	2 BLOCKS	MORE THAN 2 BLOCKS	
Percentage	6.0%	4.0%	8.0%	7.4%[1]	4.1%[1]	5.1%	3.1%	5.5%	5.1%
(Number of Cases	(592)	(364)	(87)	(323)	(720)	(77)	(155)	(811)	(1043)

[1] The difference between families with children and those without children is significant at the .05 level.

[2] Adjusted by regression to hold constant the affects of whether the respondent was present at closure, the type of neighborhood, the age of the respondent, the sex of the respondent, the ethnicity of the respondent, the distance from the school, the years in this residence, whether the respondent followed the news about the new closures or not, income, whether the respondent owned his or her home, and whether the family included children or not, except the variables listed in the table. In other words, all variables are held constant at their means except the one under study (e.g. presence of children, distance from school, etc.)

[3] The dependent variable assumes the value "1" if respondent answered "yes", they would actually move if the school closed.

[4] These percentages may seem confusing when compared to Table V-3; the difference is that these are percentages across the entire sample--not just among those answering "yes" to the"want to move" question as in Table V-3. Regression #6.

CHAPTER VI

QUALITY OF EDUCATION

Closing a neighborhood school may result in a loss in the quality of education which neighborhood children receive. Children have considerably further to go to school, which may be both time-consuming and distracting. Contact between parents and teachers may be reduced and therefore potentially valuable feedback may be diminished.

On this subject we discovered several significant differences between the closure and control neighborhoods which are supportive of the above hypotheses. For example, significantly more controls rate the quality of neighborhood public elementary education as excellent, and improving, than closures. Also, the closures are less pleased with the distance the children have to travel to school, and the tracked sample is more satisfied with the current education than the closure group who have children the same ages.

In this chapter we address the following questions:

1. Do the people in closure neighborhoods report lower quality in the education of neighborhood children than people in the control neighborhoods?
2. In the opinions of the residents, has the quality of education gotten worse in recent years?

3. What do respondents consider the most important aspects of a good education and how does proximity to the neighborhood school rank as an important aspect?

4. How satisfied are people with the distance children in their neighborhood have to travel to school?

1. Do people in closure neighborhoods report lower quality in the education of neighborhood children than people in control neighborhoods?

As noted above there is a significant (.01) finding with regards to the quality of education. In the matched controls, 18% of the households think that the quality of public elementary education is excellent as opposed to 10.2% in the matched closures. However, if we group those that ranked the quality as excellent or good this distinction disappears (51.6% among closures to 52.6% among controls).

A second comparison is to examine the tracked sample (those with children at the time of closure who subsequently moved away), with the group of current closure residents who had children at the time of closure. Here we find another significant difference with regards to school quality--the tracked group being much more pleased. In fact 67% of the tracked respondents report that the quality of education in their neighborhood is good or excellent as opposed to 43% of this closure sub-group (Table VI-1).

Across individual neighborhoods there is considerable variation. For example, over 20% of the respondents in Georgetown and Concord thought the quality of education was poor as opposed to only 6% of the people in Decatur and 4% of the people in Maple Leaf. In general, there is variation from neighborhood to neighborhood in people's perception of school quality, but that variation does not appear to be associated with school closures.

2. In the opinion of the respondents, has the quality of education declined in recent years.

Here again, there is a significant (.05) difference between the matched closures and matched controls. 40.6% of the matched controls indicate that the quality of education is improving as opposed to 32.2% of the closures. At the other end of the scale, about 30% of the people surveyed thought that quality of education had declined but there was no control/closure difference (Table VI-2).

3. What do respondents consider the most important aspects of a good education and how does proximity to the neighborhood school rank as an important aspect?

The proportion of people listing the various aspects of education as the single most important are given in Table VI-3. 52.8% of people listed good teachers as the most important factor followed by teaching the basic skills, 24.3%. Of the other factors listed, having schools within walking distance was listed as the single most important factor by only about 1% of the people surveyed. Of course people may regard the distance to school as very important without regarding it as the single most important aspect. Table VI-4 shows that about 20% of both the closure and control groups listed walking distance as one of the three most important aspects (including being listed as the single most important aspect).

There is very little difference, none of which is significant, between the tracked, matched controls and matched closures. However, when we separate out the closure households which had elementary age children at time of closure some differences do surface. Two-thirds of this group view proximity to school as either not too or somewhat important, as opposed to the tracked sample in which only a bit over one-third rate proximity to school that low. This suggests that one reason this group of closure respondents did not leave the neighborhood when the school closed is that they don't regard proximity to the school as important a factor as as the tracked group who did leave (Table VI-4).

4. How satisfied are people with the distance children in their neighborhood have to travel to school?

People in the closure neighborhoods are significantly less satisfied with the distance children have to travel to school than the control respondents. The closures who had elementary age children at the time of closure are very similar to the remainder of the closure group on this question. The tracked sample was much more satisfied with the distance to school than either the control or closure samples. 46% of the respondents thought it was excellent and only one respondent thought it was bad. The difference between the closures with children and the tracked is significant at the .01 level.

In summary, the closures and the controls have very similar notions as to what things are important in determining educational quality, but there are significant differences in how the residents view their neighborhood school. The closure residents are significantly less satisfied with the quality of education in their neighborhood, the distance children have to travel to school, and are less likely to think that the quality of education has improved since the year of the closure.

TABLE VI-1: OVERALL QUALITY OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD

	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS	ALL TRACKED	CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN
EXCELLENT	10.2%[1]	18.0%[1]	21.8%[2]	14.6 [2]
GOOD	41.1	34.6	45.5[2]	37.9[2]
FAIR	37.1	33.8	18.2	35.6
POOR	11.3	13.6	14.5	16.9

---

[1] Significant at .01 (T=3.13)

[2] Significant difference at .01 (T=2.57) for combined category of excellent and good.

[3] Household question 32; Tracked question 12.

TABLE VI-2 CHANGE IN QUALITY OF EDUCATION SINCE CLOSURE YEAR

	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS
BETTER	32.2[1]	40.6[1]
SAME	34.2	30.5
WORSE	33.6	29.0

[1] Significant at .05 (T=2.49)

[2] Household question 33.

TABLE VI-3: SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT ASPECT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

	BASIC SKILLS	DISCIPLINE	SCHOOL WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE	INDIVIDUALIZED INSTRUCTION	FRIENDLY ATMOSPHERE	GOOD TEACHERS	DON'T KNOW
MATCHED CLOSURE	24.1 %	8.2 %	1.4%	3.1%	6.4%	55.2 %	1.5 %
MATCHED CONTROL	24.3	9.1	1.0	4.8	7.4	51.3	2.0
ALL TRACKED	21.3	8.2	1.6	4.9	8.2	52.5	3.3

---

[1] Household questions 29-31; tracked #11.

TABLE VI-4: IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE FROM HOME

	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	ONE OF THREE MOST IMPORTANT[3]	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT
MATCHED CLOSURES	17.4%	28.2%	34.4%	20.0%	1.4%
MATCHED CONTROLS	15.7%	31.3%	33.2%	19.8%	1.0%
ALL TRACKED	6.6%[1]	29.5%	39.3%	24.6%	1.6%
CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN	25.7%[1]	29.1%	30.0 %	15.2%	5.3%

---

[1] Statistically significant at .01 (T≥5.2)

[2] Same interview questions as Table VI-3.

[3] This category includes single most important item: therefore the four columns on the left add to 100% for each sample group

TABLE VI-5: SATISFACTION WITH DISTANCE CHILDREN TRAVEL TO SCHOOL [3]

	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS	ALL TRACKED	CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN
EXCELLENT	13.3%[1]	30.2%[1]	45.8%[4]	13.8%[4]
GOOD	39.2	44.1	31.3	32.8
FAIR	27.5	23.0	20.8	26.7
POOR	19.9[2]	2.7[2]	2.1	26.7

[1] Difference significant at .01 (T=4.12)
[2] Difference significant at .01 (T=8.8)
[3] Household question 35; Tracked question 13.
[4] Difference significant at .01 (T=6.1)

CHAPTER VII

SERVICES FROM SCHOOLS

Neighborhood schools typically provide a meeting place for local groups, and because of this a school closure could result in reduced activities of these groups and thereby a loss in neighborhood vitality. As noted in the previous discussion of the research questions we wish to determine the extent to which neighborhood residents participate in schoolrelated or school-based activities, what services are expected from the school and its facilities, and did or would a closure affect these services.

The analysis below indicates that there is very little difference between the closure and control neighborhoods (for all households) with respect to these questions. We also compare the tracked sample with only the closure group which had children of public school age at the time of the closure, and note that the tracked sample respondents attend meetings in the school significantly more often than the closure group.

In this chapter we address the following related questions:

1. Do people in closure neighborhoods attend fewer meetings in the local schools than people in the control neighborhoods?
2. How important is the neighborhood school as a neighborhood meeting place?
3. Do people think that the public schools should be used for functions other than education; if so, for what functions should they be used?

1. Do people in closure neighborhoods attend fewer meetings in the local schools than people in the control neighborhoods?

People in closure neighborhoods attend meetings at local schools as much as people in control neighborhoods. In fact, as can be seen in Table VII-1, there are no significant differences between the controls and closures for any meeting type.

In general, people in the tracked sample are more likely to attend meetings in the public school than the closure respondents with children in the same age group. For example, 42.8% cited attendance at PTSA meetings compared to 18.4% in this closure sub-group. The tracked respondents also mentioned attendance at school related social or fund raising activities over twice as often as this closure group. Both of these differences are significant.

2. How important is the neighborhood school as a neighborhood meeting place?

The public elementary school is an important meeting place in the neighborhood, as can be seen in Table VII-1.[1] However, overall, more residents of control neighborhoods reported that they attend meetings or get together with neighbors at some place in their neighborhood than did closure residents.[2] Only 28.4% of the matched closures report that there are places in their neighborhood (as described by the closure schools' boundaries), as compared to 41.5% of the control respondents. This difference is significant at the .01 level of confidence.

---

[1] In this question the definition of neighborhood was left to the respondent and the question refers to activities held in a public elementary school building.

[2] In this question neighborhood is defined as the area within the attendance boundaries of the school under study.

We next compared what these two groups see as the single most important meeting place in the neighborhood. 7.9% of the matched controls indicate the public elementary school as opposed to only 2.9% of the matched closures. Although this difference is statistically significant it is difficult to draw any conclusions because of difficulties in understanding the way the respondents interpreted the question. Technically, there are no public elementary schools in the closure neighborhoods, although in each of these neighborhoods the building which formerly housed the school is still there. In fact other research is showing that these buildings are being utilized more for public meetings now than prior to the closure. At any rate if respondents viewed the closure school building as the most important meeting place in the neighborhood they may have responded something other than "public elementary school". As such, this 2.9% possibly understates the true value and therefore we draw no conclusions about this apparently significant difference (Table VII-2).

In summation, this analysis suggests that public elementary schools are utilized equally by control and closure respondents, but that the closure group is having to go outside of their neighborhood to use these facilities. Further support for this contention can be found in the next chapter. In Table VIII-1 it can be seen that 40.8% of the tenured closures thought that the closure caused people to have to find new meeting places. This then at least partially explains the above discussed difference in the use of meeting places within their own neighborhoods. It is reasonable to conclude that the closure of the school has caused some residents to have to leave the neighborhood to attend types of meetings that are held within the neighborhood in the control neighborhoods.

Although the neighborhood school is utilized, it is not as important as churches and parks or recreation centers. In both the control and the closure neighborhoods over 50% of the respondents mentioned these as the single most important meeting place. (Table VII-2)

3. Do people think that the public schools should be used for functions other than education; if so for what functions should the public schools be used?

About 75% of the respondents in both the closure and control neighborhoods indicated they thought that the public schools should be used for functions other than education. (Table VII-3) Table VII-4 contains a list of events the respondents indicated should take place in the public schools.

TABLE VII-1 PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION ATTENDING VARIOUS COMMUNITY MEETINGS[1]

	MATCHED CLOSURE	MATCHED CONTROL	ALL TRACKED	CLOSURES WITH CHILDREN[2]
PTSA	10.2%	9.9%	42.6%[3]	18.4%[3]
School Related Social or Fund Raising Activities	8.6	6.8	29.5[4]	12.9[4]
Citizens' Advisory Councils, Community Groups	5.1	4.6	3.3	15.0
Scouts, Campfire Girls, Youth Groups	0.9	1.5	11.5	12.2
Adult Education/ Night School	0.3	0.4	1.6	6.8
Park Dept., Recreational Activities	3.0	3.1	13.1	15.0
Pre-School, Day Care	0.4	0	0	0.7
Religious, Political Organizations	0.4	1.1	0	2.7
Other Educational	4.5	4.3	14.8	2.0
Other Meetings	4.8	8.3	8.2	7.5
	n=528	n=282	n=61	n=147

---

[1] Interview question 40 for household, #16 in tracked interview.

[2] More precisely, this group is the matched closure households who had children of elementary school age in the year of closure. For this table only, the sample has not been weighted due to idiosyncrasies in the data file.

[3] T=4.50; significant at .01

[4] T=3.40; significant at .01

TABLE VII-2: MOST IMPORTANT PLACES IN NEIGHBORHOOD FOR MEETINGS OR GETTING TOGETHER[1]

	MATCHED CLOSURE	MATCHED CONTROL
CHURCH	31.7%	22.5%
PUBLIC SCHOOL	2.9	7.9
OTHER SCHOOL	8.7	6.3
SHOPPING AREA	1.9	2.2
BAR/RESTAURANT	14.1	13.6
PARK/RECREATION CENTER/ CLUB	20.1	32.8
OTHER	20.5	14.7
	n=528	n=282

---

[1] Interview question 20.

TABLE VII-3: SHOULD PUBLIC SCHOOLS BE USED FOR OTHER ACTIVITIES BESIDES EDUCATING CHILDREN?[1]

	MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROLS	TRACKED
YES	74.4%	74.7%	61.5%
NO	25.6	25.3	38.5
	n=528	n=282	n=61

---

[1] Household question 41, tracked question #17.

TABLE VII-4: FOR WHAT OTHER ACTIVITIES SHOULD PUBLIC SCHOOLS BE USED?[1]

	CLOSURE AND CONTROL	ALL TRACKED
PTSA	22.0%	19.7%
School Related or Fund Raising	9.5	3.3
Citizens Advisory Councils, Community Groups	22.6	16.4
Scouts, Campfire Girls, Youth Groups	9.6	8.2
Adult Education/ Night School	10.9	8.2
Park Department/ Recreational Activities	14.0	19.7
Pre-School, Day Care	2.6	3.3
Religious, Political	4.5	0
Other Educational	6.5	9.8
Other Meetings	0.5	0
	n=810	n=61

[1] Household question 42, Tracked #18.

CHAPTER VIII

EFFECTS OF SCHOOL CLOSURE

The primary issue of this study is to analyze the perceived impact of closing the neighborhood elementary school. In this chapter we address this issue most directly by examining the responses to the question of what did actually happen (closure neighborhoods) or what would happen (control neighborhoods) if the neighborhood elementary school closed.

In Table VIII-1 we present the basic set of data discussed in this chapter. Generally speaking, it indicates that among the closure neighborhoods there is a feeling among sizeable parts of the population that the closure of the elementary school did cause the neighborhood to change. For example, 46% of the matched closure neighborhood residents who were there when the school closed feel that people moved out of the neighborhood because of the school closure. Additionally, 37% of the closure businesses that were there when the school closed had the same opinion. The control respondents and the non-tenured closure respondents are even more likely to be of the opinion that the closure of the elementary school would cause changes in the neighborhood. As can be seen from Table VIII-1, about twice the percentage of control and non-tenured closure respondents (as compared to tenured closure respondents) thought school closure would cause a change in each of the items we inquired into.

As noted earlier, this study was conducted a number of years after the closures occurred, and our tenured respondents are those residents who weathered whatever impact the closure had. Therefore, we would expect them to be less sensitive to the closure than would have been the entire set of residents who were there at time of closure. Presumably the tenured closures would then under-represent any negative effects that may have actually occurred. Therefore, it is our opinion that the responses for the tenured closure respondents may under-state what actually occurred.

On the other hand there are hypotheses that the control residents are over-reacting or are more likely to perceive that there would be a strong impact on the neighborhood because of their fear that they may be next. The large differences between the control and closure household response suggests support for these hypotheses.

Following this point further--it is interesting to note the length of time persons have resided in the neighborhoods. In Table VIII-2 below we present the percentage of the group we interviewed that was in the neighborhood at the time of the closure. The data do not support a hypothesis that the closure caused larger population shifts in the closure neighborhoods than occurred in control neighborhoods over the same time period.

In summation, there are indications from a sizeable portion of the tenured closure population that the neighborhood changed because of the school closure, and further there are reasons to believe that their responses may understate the true impact of the closure.

TABLE VIII-1 NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGES CAUSED (OR EXPECTED TO BE CAUSED)[1]

(% of population who responded that that event was caused, or would be caused, by school closure)

SAMPLE GROUP

	HOUSEHOLDS[1]			BUSINESSES	
	TENURED MATCHED CLOSURES	NON-TENURED MATCHED CLOSURES	MATCHED CONTROL	TENURED CLOSURE	NON-TENURED CLOSURE AND CONTROLS
People moved out of neighborhood	46.1%	81.3%	81.4%	37.3%	59.4%
Property values went down	26.1	69.1	67.6	14.0	50.0
Crime increased	23.4	44.0	39.7	13.0	26.0
People show less concern for neighborhood	28.0	43.3	45.3	33.3	36.6
People had to find new place to hold community meetings	40.8	N.A.[2]	N.A.[2]	34.1	N.A.[2]
Amount of business or industry increased	16.5	31.3	30.2	N.A.[2]	35.4
Type of people moving in changed	36.5	81.3	81.1	35.7	74.3

[1] Household questions 46 and 48, Business #24 and 26

[2] Question not asked of these respondents.

TABLE VIII-2 PERCENTAGE OF CURRENT RESIDENTS WHO RESIDED IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD AT TIME OF CLOSURE[1]

CLOSURE		CONTROL	
Neighborhood	% who were there in year of closure	Neighborhood	% who were there in year of closure
Georgetown	51.7 %	Concord	45.2 %
Interlake	48.9	Allen	49.5
Mann	55.4	Minor/Leschi	40.2

[1] Summit, Decatur and Maple Leaf are excluded because there was no control for Summit and no actual closure in Decatur. However, notable is the fact that only 13.7% of our Summit sample had lived there when the school closed. The number of cases for each neighborhood is the same as the number of households interviewed.

CHAPTER IX

SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLS

The hypothesis addressed in this chapter is that the closure of the elementary school does in fact influence residents' support for the schools. Our principal measure of this support is levy voting. In fact, when comparing matched closures with matched controls, we find a statistically significant difference (at the .01 level) between the percentage of people who claim to have voted "yes" on the last school levy. In the control neighborhoods, 81.4% indicated a "yes" vote as opposed to 68.3% in the closure neighborhoods (Table IX-2). However, in examining this question further, regression analysis (Table IX-4) using a "no" vote on the levy as the dependent variable, indicates that very little of the variance in voting is explained by whether or not it is a closure neighborhood, but instead depends on other characteristics of the respondents. For example, the statistically significant variables (at least to .05 level) which influence voting appear to be race, sex and age.[1] The existence of children in the household did not have a significant impact. It is then the differences among the demographic characteristics of the respondents in our sample groups, rather than residence in a closure neighborhood which explains this measure of support for schools. Nearness of the household to the school had an ambiguous and non-significant association. A few more control residents voted in the last levy than the closure group, but this difference is not significant (Table IX-1).

---

[1] These F-tests are presented in the Appendix on multivariate analysis, and discussion of their validity appears in the section on "Dichotomous Variables" in that same appendix.

A significantly larger percentage of residents in closure neighborhoods followed the recent news on school closures very closely. 22.9% responded that they followed this news very closely as opposed to but 15.1% among the control residents. This suggests that these neighborhoods may have been sensitized by the closure there.

In summary, there does not appear to be a difference in the support for schools which can be attributed to the control/closure dichotomy.

TABLE IX-1: PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS* WHO VOTED IN LAST SCHOOL LEVY

SAMPLE GROUP	%
Matched Closure Households[1]	40.9
Matched Control Households	43.0
Closure with Children	48.6
Decatur Tracked	80.0[2]
Geo-Int-Mann Tracked	44.4

[1] Summit was excluded for lack of a control.

[2] 80% compares to 67.7% among current Decatur residents which is the closure neighborhood with by far the greatest % voting in the levy election.

TABLE IX-2: AMONG LEVY VOTERS, PERCENTAGE VOTING YES[2]

SAMPLE GROUP	%
Matched Closure Households[1]	68.3[2]
Matched Control Households	81.4[2]
Closures with Children	69.5
Decatur Tracked	75.0
Geo-Int-Mann Tracked	83.3

[1] Summit excluded

[2] Statistically significant difference at the .01 level; T=2.96

TABLE IX-3: HOW CLOSELY RESPONDENT HAS FOLLOWED RECENT SCHOOL CLOSURE NEWS

	VERY CLOSELY	SOME-WHAT CLOSELY	A LITTLE BIT	NOT AT ALL
Closure Households[1]	22.9[2]	35.3	28.1	13.7
Control Households	15.1[2]	37.8	34.7	12.4
Closures with Children	31.4	26.8	31.7	10.1
Decatur Tracked	--	--	--	--
Geo-Int-Mann Tracked	19.6	43.4	26.1	10.9

[1] Summit excluded.

[2] Difference significant at .02 level

---

* Household questions 68-70; tracked questions 48-50.

TABLE IX-4: PERCENT OF RESPONDENTS VOTING "NO" ON THE LEVY[1,2,3,4]

	TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD			PRESENCE OF CHILDREN		DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL			OVERALL
	CLOSURE	CONTROL	DECATUR	CHILDREN	NO CHILDREN	ONE BLOCK	TWO BLOCKS	MORE THAN 2 BLOCKS	
Percentage	11.5%	8.9%	6.0%	10.5%	10.3%	16.0%	6.1%	9.4%	10.4%
(Number of Cases)	(592)	(364)	(87)	(323)	(720)	(77)	(155)	(811)	(1043)

[1] Adjusted by regression to hold constant the effects of whether the respondent was present at closure, the type of neighborhood, the age of the respondent, the sex of the respondent, the ethnicity of the respondent, the distance from the school, the years in this residence, whether the respondent followed the news about the new closures or not, income, whether the respondent owned his or her home, and whether the family included children or not, except the variables listed at the top of the main headings. In other words--all variables are held constant at their mean except the one under study.

[2] Voting "no" on the most recent levy was used as a measure of school support (or lack of it). All respondents who voted "no" were assigned a value of one, all others "0". Therefore, people who did not vote, or voted "yes" were lumped together. Refusals were excluded. We regressed this against a set of demographic variables to examine the net association between school support and closures.

[3] Because of the skew of the dependent variable in this equation there may be bias in the F-statistics. This is discussed in the section "Dichotomous Variables" in the appendix on Multivariate Analysis.

[4] Regression #7

CHAPTER X

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

This chapter discusses the methodology used to collect the data which has formed the basis of this report. This chapter is presented in three sections:

A. Training of interviewers

B. Field Procedures

C. Quality Control Procedures

A. Training of interviewers

All interviewers were trained over a two day period before they administered any interviews. The training covered the survey instruments in detail as well as interviewing techniques and procedures.

Each interviewer was provided with two training manuals to review prior to the training sessions and for reference during training and the survey itself. The MPR general training manual discussed conventions used in all of our surveys and the basic concepts and techniques of interviewing. The second manual was designed specifically for this survey and covered definitions of terms used in certain questions, instructions, and explanations of the objectives of many questions. Copies of these manuals are appended to this report.

The designer of the survey instrument gave the interviewers an orientation to the study, presented video tapes on technique, and then discussed each of the three interviews question-by-question. The survey manager covered general interviewing techniques and field procedures with special emphasis in handling refusals, validation of interviews, and quantity and quality of work requirements.

In addition to the lectures by the survey designer and manager, the staff was shown an hour long MPR video tape on general theory and technique that was designed for the training of interviewers. Also, each interviewer participated in mock interviews with another MPR staff member before doing any field work.

Appended to this report is the agenda of the training sessions.

B. Field Procedures

Interviewers were paid by a piece-rate system for field work. They received $7.50 for each completed household or business interview and $8.25 for each completed tracked interview. During the final week of the survey the payment was raised for clean-up interviewing.

Two assignment sheets, each containing fifteen addresses at which to administer the interviews, were given to each interviewer upon completion of the training course. The addresses on each sheet were usually located within one elementary school attendance area. These assignment sheets also specified the type of interview to be done at each address and contained space for the interviewers to record all attempts to administer an interview at each address. An example of the assignment sheet is attached.

Once an interviewer had a "final status" on fourteen of the fifteen addresses on a sheet, another one was issued to them. A final status was obtained for a particular address in a number ways as described below:

1) Interview completed.

2) Respondent refused to be interviewed.

3) Household or business no longer exists or was vacant.

4) Could not contact respondent for the interview (not home). In order to have a final status of "not home", at least four attempts were made to contact an eligible respondent at the household or business. Two contact attempts occurred after 6:00 p.m. on different days during the week, one attempt took place prior to 6:00 p.m. on a weekday, and at least one attempt was made on the weekend.

5) A business other than the one listed was located at the address and it was not a community oriented business.

6) No member of a tracked interview family ever lived in the closure neighborhood listed. In some attendance areas the interview type was changed to household and the interview completed when this situation occurred.

7) Could not contact respondent due to high security of apartment building, i.e., the building was always locked and there was no intercom system available.

8) Respondents did not speak English, were deaf, or very retarded. This group accounts for about ½ of 1% of the sample.

Although another assignment sheet was issued to someone once he had obtained a final status for fourteen of the addresses on a sheet, he was required to eventually obtain a final status for all addresses assigned to him.

All initial contacts of household or traced interview respondents occurred between the hours of 3:00 and 9:00 p.m. weekdays and 10:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Saturdays. Contacts with business respondents occurred throughout the day during business hours. Interviews were completed outside of these prescribed hours only at the request of the respondent.

Interviewers were required to report to the office twice each week to turn in their completed interviews. At that time they were given additional assignment sheets and any previously completed interviews returned by the quality control readers that needed resolution of some problems. If the nature of the data problems were such that no further contact of the respondents was necessary in order to resolve them, the interviewers were required to deal with the interviews immediately and return them to Quality Control department. If it was necessary to re-contact a respondent in order to resolve the problems in an interview, they were required to do so within one day.

A continuous process of validation of interviews occurred throughout the survey. A total of 178 or 13% of the interviews completed were randomly selected for validation. The validator contacted the interview respondent by phone or in-person and re-asked a subset of questions in the interview. Fabrication or distortion of any data in an interview would result in the immediate dismissal of an interviewer . Appended to this report are copies of the three validation forms that were used.

C. Quality Control Procedures Manual

Appearing on the following pages is a reproduction of the Quality Control Procedures Manual which was used for this study.

Q.C. MANUAL

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

Introduction

This manual will describe the procedures used to assure the quality and integrity of the data collected throughout the Neighborhood Survey. While proof-reading each interview, QC'ers will check the logical flow of each interview, examining for consistency in data throughout, and preparing the Interview for keypunching, making necessary corrections when possible.

General Information:

The following information should be considered before QC'ing interviews:

Right Justifying Numbers: In all cases where a number is to be entered in boxes, there should only be one digit per box. All numerical entries should be right justified, i.e., age of child 7 years should appear as

0 7

Fixed Alternative Responses: Make sure the fixed alternative responses have a number circled beside the appropriate response. If an interviewer has made a correction, the incorrect answer should be crossed out, and the correct answer should be circled.

Writing in Margins: Any comments written in the margin is an aid to the QCer in determining in which category the response belongs.

Date: Record the last two digits of the year only throughout each Interview. For Q. 1 in the business and household interviews, the year 1974 will be used to identify those families living in neighborhood less than 2 years. This will relate to Q. 9 in Business Interview and Q. 36 in Household Interview.

Skip Direction: An inappropriate question to the respondent will follow with a skip direction to the next relevant question. Please make sure skip directions are followed. You will find skip direction through each interview.

Grid Instructions: Grids were designed so that some questions can be asked repeatedly for different variables. You may encounter situations which may cause a problem. Pay special attention to grid responses, and examine for logical response and consistency in data.

> Special rules for Grid Responses in Household Interview Q. 6-8, and Q. 29-31: If there are 3 or more "Very Important", the 3 and 1 most important must come from those items. If there are less than 3, the "most important" should come from the "somewhat important" category as well. The only time the 3 or 1 "most important" may be from the "not too important" item is when there are fewer than 3 items in the "very" and "somewhat important" columns.

I suggest that you reread this grid to make sure the anwers make sense before you proceed to the next question.

Other Categories: All other categories should be a respondent's answer which doesn't fit one of the pre-coded categories. QC-ers should keep a log of the other categories. Other categories are found in Household Interview: Q. 2, 3, 20, 26, 28, 40, & 42; in Business Interview: Q. 2, 13, 15, 20, [illegible]3; and in Tracked: Q. 2, 16, 18, 20, 21, 27, 29 & 44.

Factual Responses: For factual answers--particularly the one that asks for the respondent's age--if respondent answers, "I'm in my 50's", use the midpoint year, 55.

DKs: If a respondent cannot give an answer for a question a DK answer is acceptable. The Interviewer should write Ⓓ next to the question.

Post Code: Distance from School--Please record the post code # when the Interview has been QC'd. A map has been prepared giving all necessary information for determining post code #.

The post code # will not be necessary for the Tracked Interview.

Initial Interview: All completed Interviews should be initialed by QCer. Any interviews needing corrections should be submitted back to Interviewer with necessary corrections explained.

Cover Page

Cover Page Information:

1. Each Interview should have a Label placed on it.

2. The Label gives the following information:

   I.D. # of the Interview.

   Type: Identifies the type of interview, i.e., Control, Closure, Threatened Closure.

   Attendance District: Defines School District.

   No. of years: Will either be 5 or 10

   Closure year: Year in which Closure occurred.

ID Number -- Below Label

The ID number below the label should be inserted by Interviewer. This number should agree with # on label. The address should also be written on Interview--by Interviewer, along with Interviewer ID#.

Time Begin and Completion Time--should be filled in by Interviewer.

The Household Questionnaire

The Household Interview addresses itself to several issues: primarily--why do people move out of neighborhoods; how do people see their neighborhoods, and the trends that have taken place in them over the last few years; the importance of the neighborhood school in providing a quality education; the importance of school as an educational institution in the neighborhood; and what effect school closure has on a neighborhood. To accomplish the task of getting these responses, the Household Interview was designed.

There are ten divisions in this Interview.

Q. 1-8, designed to get respondents' opinion about neighborhoods in general.

Q. 1. Be sure response is right justified.

Q. 2 & 3. May have more than one answer. If an "other" answer is given, be sure it's a legitimate other. All others for these responses should only be neighborhood related.

Grid responses for Q. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8: Q. C. for logical responses. Make sure grid response to Q. 4 C & E are followed correctly. (See special direction above grid for Q. 4.

Q. 6, 7, & 8: Be aware of the contradictions that may occur in these responses.

Q. 9-12: This set of questions asks about the current situation of the respondent's definition of neighborhood is allowed.

Q. 10-21: The respondent is asked to answer about an area roughly equal to ghe neighborhood school attendance district.

Each of these questions will only require once answer. Be sure skip directions are followed where applicable.

On question 20, there must only be one answer. If more than one answer is given, treat as a correction.

Q. 22: # of years Respondent has lived in neighborhood. For this response the year 1974 will be considered less than 2 years. Q.C. for consistency. This answer should be cross checked with answer #1.

Q. 23-28: Directed to families who have lived in the current home 2 years or more. Cross check with response given in Q. 1 and Q. 22. They should agree.

Check for ID# on page 12 of Interview.

Q. 27: Be sure the changes mentioned in Q. 23, 24, and 25 are reflected in this response.

Q. 28: Any text response should be written on separate "other sheet".

Q. 31-37: Deals with the quality of education in respondent's neighborhood, and the directions it has taken over the last few years.

1. Response should be straight-forward--QC.
2. Note special instructions for Q. 35 and 37.

Q. 38-43: Deals with school related and school based activities--

1. The responses here are fairly straightforward. Watch for skip directions.

Q. 44-47: Deals with actual effects of closure on the community. Answers should be fairly clear. Check for ID# on page 19. Be sure skip direction for Q. 47 is follow-through.

Q. 48-50: Series of questions deals with hypothetical school closure for respondents living in closure neighborhoods.

1. Respondents who are controls or threatened closure, and closure people who did not live in neighborhood should answer this series of questions.

2. Cross check with Q. 44 and 45. This should also be checked with information on label (front-cover page).

Q. 49: Refers specifically to children of elementary school age or younger. If all children are over 12, use code 3 (NO children in household). Cross check this with answer to Q. 55. The (YES) and (NO) options in Q. 49 are intended for people who might actually use private elementary schools.

Q. 51-71: Concerned with demographic information, including ages of household members, children's school attendance district, income and home ownership. There are a few questions regarding levy voting and how closely respondent has followed the news on school closure.

Q. 57 and 58: If there is only one child in the age group, use "All are". "Some are" refers to (a few) of a larger group of children.

Also, watch out for the double negative in Q. 59. Option 2 means "All children aged 5-12 are in public elementary school.

Post Code: Use the map to determine the distance relationship. Code figure (1, 2, or 3) in answer box.

Initial interview for completion.

The Business Interview

The Business Interview was designed to gather response to the same issues set forth in the Household Interview. To accomplish this--the Interview has five sections which address themselves to specific issues.

Q. 1-8: Ask about the respondent's opinion about his/her current neighborhood. All questions are straightforward. Be sure there's a response to each question. Special attention should be given to Q. 2. There should only be one answer here. Interviewers may get this confused with Q. 2 in Household and Tracked Interview which allow more than one response.

Q. 9-22: Deals with trends in area and business over the last few years.

Q. 9: Cross-Check response with answer given in Q. 1. They should agree.

Q. 14: Be sure changes in Q. 10, 11 & 12 are picked up reflected in response for this question.

Q. 16: Cross check with year given on label, and Q. 1. Notice skip directions given for those businesses not there in the year given.

Q. 21, 22, & 23: Should have updated labels included. Be sure each Interview has one for each question.

Q. 25: Notice skip direction given after question 29.

Q.26-28: For control respondents. Questions deal with hypothetical school closure situations. Be sure an answer is given for each question.

Q.29-31: Ask demographic questions about the respondents and his or her business. Be sure each question has been answered.

Post Code: Use the map to determine the distance from school relationship code.

Initial when completed.

Tracked Interview

Tracked Interview Introduction:

The Tracked Interview was designed to follow up on families that currently have children enrolled in the Seattle Public Schools, who moved out of the closure attendance districts within a year before or after closure.

The Interview Divisions:

The interview is divided into five sections.

Q. 1-8: Concerned basically with the respondent's opinion of neighborhoods in general, and reasons for selecting his present neighborhood in which to live. There should be an answer for each question. Any numerical responses should be right justified. All other responses should be written on separate "other sheet".

Please note question 4--(grid response)--Be sure special directions for (4c) and (4e) are followed correctly.

For the grid responses for Q. 5, 6 & 7, a logical pattern should follow in respondent's response. Any contradictions should be noted as corrections.

Q. 9-13: Deals with quality education. The respondent is asked to rate the education children receive in his/her current neighborhood.

1. Again--pay careful attention to the logic in grid responses for Q. 9, 10 & 11.

2. Q. 12 should have only one response. If (D) is selection Interviewer should follow skip pattern. All other response should go directly to next question.

3. Q. 13-- one response per sub-question.

Q. 14-19: The respondent is asked about his knowledge of and participation in school-related and school-based activities.

1. Be sure the I. D. # of the Interview is coded on the lower portion of page 8.

2. There are skip directions given in these series of questions. Be sure skip directions are followed.

3. Check to be sure there's a response for each question.

Q. 20-33: Ask about situation in the closure neighborhood. What was happening at the time respondent moved, why they left, and their awareness of closure.

Q. 20: Should have only one response. If more than one response, note correction to interviewer. Inform him that respondent should choose the reason most important to him. If respondent cannot choose answer should be DKed, proceed to Q. #22.

Q. 21: May have more than one response.

Q. 22-26: One response per question.

Q.27: Be sure the changes mentioned in Q.20 are also added here.

Q.28, 29 & 29a: Be sure skip patterns are followed properly. There should be an update label inserted for Q.28 and 29a. Make sure the label is inserted and answered correctly. Refer back to Q.20 and 27 for consistency in response.

Q.30 & 31: Notice skip directions, also all numerical responses should be right justified. Be sure to check ID# at bottom of page 15.

The last section, Q.34-35: asks for demographic information about the respondent.

For Q.33, be sure all children listed between 5-12 are picked up in Q.39.

Q.44: Be sure only one response is given. If more than one--send back to interviewer as a correction. All other questions should basically have one response.

Disregard Post Code.

Initial Interview when completed.

APPENDIX

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Seven regression estimates were run using the set of independent variables defined below. For each regression the regression coefficients, the standard error of the regression coefficients, and the F statistics of each regression coefficient are reported as well as the R^2 and the standard error of the estimate.

The F statistics allow us to test whether a particular characteristic is significantly correlated with the dependent variable when the effects of the other included variables are held constant.

Because many of the variables used in the analysis can take on more than 2 values, a set of dummy variables were used. For example, we have three kinds of neighborhoods in the sample: closure, threatened closure, and control neighborhoods. Two dummy variables were created; one that equals one when the neighborhood is a closure neighborhood and another that takes on the value one when the neighborhood is a threatened closure neighborhood. This allows us to test for differences between the closure neighborhoods and control neighborhoods. The use of but two dummy variables eliminates the problem of linear dependence.

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Definition of Variables

The regression analysis utilized the following set of independent variables in all of the regressions.

Present at Closure equals 1 if the respondent lived in the neighborhood when the school closed or lived in the control neighborhood when the matched closure school closed; 0 otherwise.

Closure equals 1 when the neighborhood was Summit, Interlake, Mann, or Georgetown; 0 otherwise.

Threatened equals 1 when the neighborhood was Decatur; 0 otherwise.

Kids equals 1 when the household contained any children between 5 and 12 years old; 0 otherwise.

Young equals 1 when the respondent is age 18 to 24; 0 otherwise.

Middle equals 1 when the respondent is age 45 to 64; 0 otherwise.

Old equals 1 when the respondent is age 65 or older; 0 otherwise.

Black equals 1 when the respondent is black; 0 otherwise.

Other minority equals 1 when the respondent is a minority other than black; 0 otherwise.

Distance 1 equals 1 if the respondent lives within one block of the neighborhood school and lives in a control neighborhood, and it equals 1 if the respondent lives within one block of the closure school and lives in a closure neighborhood; 0 otherwise.

Distance 2 is defined like distance 1 for a 2-block area.

2-5 years equals 1 if the respondent has lived in the current dwelling more than 2 but less than or equal to 5 years; 0 otherwise.

5-10 years is defined like 2-5 years for more than 5 years but less than or equal to 10 years.

10 years or more is defined like 2-5 years for more than 10 years.

News equals 1 if the respondent indicated they followed the news about the recent closures very closely or somewhat closely; 0 otherwise.

$5,000-$10,000 equals 1 if the respondent indicated that family income was $5,000 to $9,999.

$10,000-$20,000 defined like $5,000-$10,000 for incomes from $10,000 to $19,999.

$20,000 plus defined like $5,000-$10,000 for incomes of $20,000 or more.

Sex equals 1 if the respondent was male; 0 if female.

Own home equals 1 if the respondent's family owns their home.

REGRESSION 1: Has the neighborhood become worse?

Dependent variable equals 1 when the respondent indicated that the neighborhood has become worse since the closing of the school (or the closing of the matched closure school if the respondent lives in a control neighborhood). It also equals 1 if the respondent has lived in the neighborhood since sometime after the closure but longer than 2 years and also believes that the neighborhood has become worse during that time. It equals 0 otherwise.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	0.02933	0.04075	0.518
Closure	0.00444	0.03182	0.019
Threatened	-0.15328	0.05486	7.808
Kids	0.01714	0.02808	0.373
Young	0.01444	0.03668	0.155
Middle	0.05658	0.03211	3.105
Old	-0.01866	0.04097	0.207
Black	-0.00223	0.02985	0.006
Other Minority	-0.05341	0.04821	1.227
Distance 1	0.08116	0.04366	3.456
Distance 2	0.06772	0.03236	4.380
2-5 Years	0.09772	0.03693	7.003
5-10 Years	0.14462	0.04631	9.754
10 Years or More	0.20028	0.04580	19.125
News	-0.01668	0.01813	0.847
$5,000-$10,000	-0.03897	0.03232	1.454
$10,000-$20,000	-0.02082	0.03035	0.471
$20,000 Plus	-0.05583	0.04054	1.897
Sex	0.03683	0.02353	2.452
Owns Home	-0.09975	0.02990	11.132
(Constant)	0.09893		

$R^2 = .08$
Standard Error = .36

REGRESSION 2: How important is having schools within walking distance in providing a good education?

Dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent indicated that walking distance was the single most important factor or one of the three most important factors in a good education. It equals zero otherwise.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	0.02002	0.04479	0.200
Closure	-0.02919	0.03499	0.696
Threatened	-0.01982	0.06031	0.108
Kids	-0.01915	0.03087	0.385
Young	-0.03288	0.04032	0.665
Middle	0.03135	0.03530	0.789
Old	0.04443	0.04504	0.973
Black	0.08355	0.03282	6.482
Other Minority	0.03602	0.05300	0.462
Distance 1	-0.03603	0.04800	0.564
Distance 2	-0.02903	0.03557	0.666
2-5 Years	0.04300	0.04060	1.122
5-10 Years	-0.04534	0.05091	0.793
10 Years or More	-0.02959	0.05035	0.345
News	-0.00500	0.01993	0.063
$5,000-$10,000	-0.04203	0.03553	1.399
$10,000-$20,000	-0.07681	0.03336	5.301
$20,000 Plus	-0.07667	0.04456	2.960
Sex	0.04013	0.02586	2.408
Owns Home	0.03769	0.03287	2.408
(Constant)	0.20402		

$R^2 = .03$
Standard Error = .40

REGRESSION 3: How important is the quality of the schools in making an area a good place to live?

Dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent indicated that the quality of the schools is the single most important factor or one of the three most important factors in making a neighborhood a good place to live.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	0.05261	0.04760	1.222
Closure	-0.03709	0.03718	0.995
Threatened	0.08512	0.06408	1.764
Kids	0.31679	0.03280	93.296
Young	-0.05788	0.04285	1.825
Middle	-0.06830	0.03751	3.316
Old	-0.14470	0.04786	9.142
Black	0.04074	0.03486	1.365
Other Minority	-0.00521	0.05632	0.009
Distance 1	-0.06843	0.05100	1.800
Distance 2	-0.06276	0.03780	2.757
2-5 Years	-0.03904	0.04314	0.819
5-10 Years	-0.03707	0.05409	0.470
10 Years or More	0.03923	0.05350	0.538
News	0.05343	0.02117	6.366
\$5,000-\$10,000	0.02279	0.03776	0.364
\$10,000-\$20,000	0.00272	0.03545	0.006
\$20,000 Plus	0.01975	0.04735	0.174
Sex	0.03996	0.02748	2.114
Owns Home	0.01862	0.03492	0.284
(Constant)	0.18344		

$R^2 = .17$
Standard Error = .42

REGRESSION 4: How important is having a school nearby in making a neighborhood a good place to live?

Dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent indicates that having a school within walking distance is the single most important factor or one of the three most important factors in making a neighborhood a good place to live.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	-0.04348	0.03664	1.408
Closure	-0.00442	0.02862	0.024
Threatened	0.14304	0.04934	8.406
Kids	0.20244	0.02525	64.271
Young	0.07692	0.03299	5.437
Middle	0.03199	0.02888	1.227
Old	0.04186	0.03685	1.291
Black	0.01895	0.02685	0.498
Other Minority	0.06315	0.04336	2.121
Distance 1	-0.00149	0.03927	0.001
Distance 2	0.01313	0.02910	0.203
2-5 Years	0.02561	0.03321	0.595
5-10 Years	0.00457	0.04165	0.012
10 Years or More	-0.02974	0.04119	0.521
News	-0.00146	0.01630	0.008
\$5,000-\$10,000	0.00618	0.02907	0.045
\$10,000-\$20,000	-0.01124	0.02729	0.170
\$20,000 Plus	-0.05361	0.03646	2.162
Sex	-0.01652	0.02116	0.609
Owns Home	0.03417	0.02689	1.615
(Constant)	0.04524		

$R^2 = .10$
Standard Error = .33

REGRESSION 5: Would you want to move if the neighborhood school closed?

Dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent says he/she would want to move if the neighborhood schools closed and equals 0 otherwise.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	-0.00381	0.03767	0.010
Closure	0.01353	0.02942	0.212
Threatened	0.05359	0.05072	1.117
Kids	0.26420	0.02596	103.579
Young	0.07175	0.03391	4.477
Middle	-0.06274	0.02969	4.467
Old	-0.06088	0.03788	2.583
Black	0.01460	0.02760	0.280
Other Minority	0.09395	0.04458	4.442
Distance 1	-0.06409	0.04037	2.521
Distance 2	-0.00248	0.02992	0.007
2-5 Years	-0.00650	0.03414	0.036
5-10 Years	-0.00932	0.04281	0.047
10 Years or More	-0.03990	0.04234	0.888
News	0.03070	0.01676	3.355
$5,000-$10,000	0.04760	0.02988	2.537
$10,000-$20,000	0.01985	0.02806	0.501
$20,000 Plus	0.00197	0.03748	0.003
Sex	-0.00628	0.02175	0.083
Owns Home	-0.01259	0.02764	0.207
(Constant)	0.07593		

$R^2 = .18$
Standard Error = .33

REGRESSION 6: Would you actually move if the schools closed?

Dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent says he/she would actually move if the schools closed and 0 otherwise.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	-0.02076	0.02453	0.716
Closure	0.01987	0.01916	1.076
Threatened	0.03150	0.03303	0.910
Kids	0.03264	0.01690	3.729
Young	0.02819	0.02208	1.630
Middle	-0.02978	0.01933	2.314
Old	-0.03446	0.02466	1.952
Black	-0.00357	0.01797	0.040
Other Minority	-0.01168	0.02903	0.162
Distance 1	-0.00457	0.02628	0.030
Distance 2	-0.02403	0.01948	1.522
2-5 Years	-0.02525	0.02223	1.290
5-10 Years	0.00923	0.02788	0.110
10 Years or More	-0.01237	0.02757	0.201
News	0.00778	0.01091	0.508
$5,000-$10,000	0.01406	0.01946	0.522
$10,000-$20,000	0.00513	0.01827	0.079
$20,000 Plus	0.01603	0.02441	0.431
Sex	-0.02729	0.01416	2.713
Owns Home	0.04787	0.01800	7.074
(Constant)	0.03436		

$R^2 = .03$

Standard Error = .23

REGRESSION 7: Did you vote no in the levy elections?

Dependent variable equals 1 if the respondent says he/she voted "no" in the levy election and 0 otherwise.

VARIABLE	B	STANDARD ERROR B	F
Present at Closure	0.03856	0.03313	1.355
Closure	0.02599	0.02588	1.009
Threatened	-0.04732	0.04460	1.126
Kids	0.00202	0.02283	0.008
Young	-0.01255	0.02982	0.169
Middle	0.06677	0.02611	6.542
Old	0.06103	0.03331	3.356
Black	-0.10495	0.02427	18.697
Other Minority	-0.10052	0.03920	6.575
Distance 1	0.06638	0.03550	3.497
Distance 2	-0.03382	0.02631	1.652
2-5 Years	0.02940	0.03003	0.959
5-10 Years	0.03241	0.03765	0.741
10 Years or More	-0.00681	0.03724	0.033
News	0.01344	0.01474	0.832
\$5,000-\$10,000	-0.01448	0.02628	0.303
\$10,000-\$20,000	-0.01161	0.02467	0.221
\$20,000 Plus	0.01118	0.03296	0.115
Sex	-0.06435	0.01913	11.317
Owns Home	0.07154	0.02431	8.660
(Constant)	0.6893		

$R^2 = .09$
Standard Error = .29

Tables Adjusted by Regression

Throughout this report we reported proportions that have been adjusted by regressions. We have done this to enhance the readability of the report for those people who are unfamiliar with regression analysis. The intent of our procedure is the same as for regression analysis--to measure variance attributable to an independent variable while the effects of other variables are held constant.

The procedure for creating these tables is quite straightforward. All the independent variables not included in the table are set equal to their mean value.[1] Each mean is multiplied by the appropriate beta coefficient and the sum of these products is added to the constant term. This sum becomes the new constant term. Then the relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable included in the table is then computed using the regression coefficients of this independent variable and the new constant term.

Dummy Variables

One additional procedure needs to be mentioned. When the independent variable is continuous or can take on several values, a set of dummy variables is used. For example, income can take on many values but for the regressions income was described by a set of dummy variables. The first dummy variable took on the value "1" when annual income was less than $5000 and "0" otherwise; the second took the value "1" when income was between $5000 and $10,000, etc. This procedure allows the relationship between the dependent variable and income to be either linear or non-linear. If a single variable was used for income, simple regression techniques could show only the best linear relationship.

---

[1] Values other than the mean could be used if a particular group was to be used as a norm.

Dichotomous Variables

Regression estimates on dichotomous variables have two general problems. First the regression estimates may result in predicted values beyond the logical limits of 0 and 1. This problem becomes more likely when the dichotomous variable is skewed to either extreme. A few of our predicted values were beyond the 0 and 1 limits. We could correct this problem by using probit analysis; however, it is difficult and expensive to use and difficult to interpret. We did not think the use of probit analysis was worth the expense, time and loss in clarity that would have been necessary.

The other problem is heteroscedasticity. All dichotomous variables, regardless of the skewness of the split, have non-continuous error terms. These terms must take on one of two values. This value is either a value that results in the total equation equaling 1 or a value that results in the total equation equalling 0. As such, the error term of a dichotomous variable is a binomial. When the dichotomous variable is split about 50-50 the variance is.25. When the split is 60-40 the variance is about.24 which is quite close to the .25. So the splits close to 50-50 have a small problem with heteroscadasticity. As the split becomes more extreme the swing in the variance becomes much greater. For example a 90-10 split would have a variance of .09 while a 95-5 split would have a variance of .045; a 2 to 1 difference.

One of our dichotomous dependent variables does have an extreme split. Voting no on the school levy was a 10-90 split, so we may have a problem with heteroscedasticity. However, this problem does not bias the regression coefficients, so that the proportions reported are fine. What it does do is effect the unbiased efficiency of the estimate. As such our F-tests of significance may not be correct because of bias in our estimates of the standard errors. However, it is unlikely that they are so biased so as to expect that the "closure" variable is truly significant.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER III

APPENDIX TABLE

OVERALL NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION[1]

Number of responses and (row percentage)

Neighborhood	VERY SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	SOMEWHAT DIS-SATISFIED	VERY DIS-SATISFIED
Interlake	154 (65.5)	71 (30.2)	8 (3.4)	2 (0.9)
Allen	55 (56.7)	36 (37.1)	5 (5.2)	1 (1.0)
Mann	90 (44.1)	83 (40.7)	20 (9.8)	11 (5.4)
Minor-Leschi	43 (46.7)	36 (39.1)	8 (8.7)	5 (5.4)
Georgetown	42 (47.2)	31 (34.8)	12 (13.5)	4 (4.5)
Concord	37 (39.8)	38 (40.9)	9 (9.7)	9 (9.7)
Decatur	74 (79.6)	17 (18.3)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)
Maple Leaf	68 (70.8)	21 (21.9)	7 (7.3)	0 --
Summit	37 (38.9)	45 (47.4)	8 (8.4)	5 (5.3)

---

[1] Intervie[illegible]stion 9.

APPENDIX TABLE:

SPECIFIC ASPECTS OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION [1]

Number of respondents and (column percentage):

	Interlake	Allen	Mann	Minor-Leschi	Georgetown	Concord	Decatur	Maple Leaf	Summit
Do neighbors help each other out?									
YES...............	165 (77.5)	70 (78.7)	160 (85.1)	56 (69.1)	57 (71.3)	70 (82.4)	79 (88.4)	63 (69.2)	43 (53.8)
NO................	48 (22.5)	19 (21.3)	28 (24.9)	25 (30.9)	23 (28.8)	15 (17.6)	10 (11.2)	28 (30.8)	37 (46.2)
How often do crimes occur?									
A LOT.............	22 (10.5)	6 (7.2)	38 (21.3)	29 (37.2)	8 (10.4)	19 (23.8)	4 (4.5)	9 (10.2)	32 (39.0)
SOME..............	84 (40.2)	39 (47.0)	58 (32.6)	21 (26.9)	29 (37.7)	31 (38.8)	44 (50.0)	26 (29.5)	28 (34.1)
A LITTLE..........	103 (49.3)	38 (45.8)	82 (46.1)	28 (35.9)	40 (51.9)	30 (37.5)	40 (45.5)	53 (60.2)	22 (26.8)
How many vacant houses?									
A LOT.............	1 (0.4)	2 (2.2)	36 (18.8)	13 (14.6)	6 (7.1)	0 --	0 --	0 --	8 (9.9)
SOME..............	16 (7.0)	6 (6.7)	34 (17.7)	13 (14.6)	9 (10.6)	11 (12.1)	7 (7.7)	2 (2.2)	18 (22.2)
A FEW.............	100 (44.1)	36 (40.4)	97 (50.5)	50 (56.2)	43 (50.6)	50 (54.9)	32 (35.2)	24 (26.1)	34 (42.0)
NONE..............	110 (48.5)	45 (50.6)	25 (13.0)	13 (14.6)	27 (31.8)	30 (33.0)	52 (57.1)	66 (71.7)	21 (25.9)

---

[1] Interview questions 11, 14, and 15.

APPENDIX TABLE Is the presence of an elementary school in the neighborhood a good thing or a bad thing for you?[1]

	GOOD	BAD	NEITHER/ DON'T CARE
Interlake	140 (59.6)	4 (1.7)	91 (38.7)
Allen	58 (59.8)	2 (2.1)	37 (38.1)
Mann	160 (78.0)	6 (2.9)	39 (19.0)
Minor-Leschi	59 (64.1)	4 (4.3)	29 (31.5)
Georgetown	56 (62.9)	5 (5.6)	28 (31.5)
Concord	54 (58.1)	1 (1.1)	38 (40.9)
Decatur	66 (71.0)	2 (2.2)	25 (26.9)
Maple Leaf	72 (75.8)	0	23 (24.2)
Summit	50 (52.6)	4.(4.2)	41 (43.2)

---

[1] Interview question 50.

APPENDIX TABLE:

MOST IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF NEIGHBORHOOD SATISFACTION

Number of responses and (row percentage):

	Convenience to Shopping	Low Crime Rate	Helpful Neighbors	Quality of Schools	Convenience to Work	Similar Neighbors	Walking Distance to Schools	Convenience to Transportation	Convenience to Parks, etc	Other
Interlake	33 (14.1)	88 (37.6)	17 (7.3)	17 (7.3)	27 (11.5)	4 (1.7)	6 (2.6)	23 (9.8)	16 (6.8)	3 (1.3)
Allen	3 (3.1)	54 (55.7)	9 (9.3)	7 (9.3)	5 (5.2)	2 (2.1)	0	11 (11.3)	6 (6.2)	0
Mann	14 (6.8)	96 (46.8)	30 (14.6)	22 (10.7)	7 (3.4)	8 (3.9)	8 (3.9)	18 (8.8)	0	2 (1.0)
Minor-Leschi	8 (8.8)	34 (37.4)	6 (6.6)	9 (9.9)	9 (9.9)	2 (2.2)	5 (5.5)	13 (14.3)	5 (5.5)	0
Georgetown	10 (11.2)	43 (48.3)	20 (22.5)	2 (2.2)	7 (7.9)	1 (1.1)	0	5 (5.6)	1 (1.1)	0
Concord	12 (13.0)	40 (43.5)	14 (15.2)	9 (9.8)	8 (8.7)	4 (4.3)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	1 (1.1)	0
Decatur	7 (7.6)	41 (44.6)	13 (14.1)	12 (13.0)	9 (9.8)	3 (3.3)	4 (4.3)	2 (2.2)	0	1 (1.1)
Maple Leaf	5 (5.2)	50 (52.1)	11 (11.5)	12 (12.5)	9 (9.4)	3 (3.1)	2 (2.1)	2 (2.1)	2 (2.1)	0

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IV

APPENDIX TABLE: OVERALL PERCEPTION OF CHANGE IN NEIGHBORHOOD SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE

Number of responses and (row percentage):

	IMPROVED	STAYED THE SAME	GOTTEN WORSE
Interlake	55 (23.6)	152 (65.2)	26 (11.2)
Allen	14 (14.6)	61 (63.5)	21 (21.9)
Mann	68 (33.7)	88 (43.6)	46 (22.8)
Minor-Leschi	29 (32.6)	46 (44.9)	20 (22.5)
Georgetown	8 (9.2)[1]	50 (57.5)	29 (33.3)
Concord	29 (31.9)[1]	46 (50.5)	16 (17.6)
Decatur	20 (21.5)	70 (75.3)	3 (3.2)
Maple Leaf	19 (19.8)	67 (69.8)	10 (10.4)
Summit	20 (22.2)	52 (57.8)	18 (20.0)

---

[1] Difference significant at .01; T=4.1

APPENDIX TABLE: PERCEIVED CHANGES IN NEIGHBORHOOD QUALITY SINCE YEAR OF CLOSURE[1]

Number of responses and (row percentage):

	Neighbors helping each other out--			Property values compared to city as a whole--			Property upkeep--			Crime rate--			Number of vacant houses--		
	MORE	SAME	LESS	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	HIGHER	SAME	LOWER	MORE	SAME	LESS
Interlake	50 (23.7)	140 (66.4)	21 (10.0)	21 (11.5)	86 (47.0)	76 (41.5)	42 (30.4)	76 (55.1)	20 (14.5)	32 (25.8)	77 (62.1)	15 (12.1)	4 (3.0)	65 (48.5)	65 (48.5)
Allen	20 (22.2)	58 (64.4)	12 (13.3)	10 (14.5)	33 (47.8)	26 (37.7)	12 (20.0)	35 (58.3)	13 (21.7)	18 (31.6)	30 (52.6)	9 (15.8)	6 (12.0)	25 (50.0)	19 (38.0)
Mann	62 (33.7)	90 (48.9)	32 (17.4)	20 (14.0)	33 (23.1)	89 (62.2)	58 (39.7)	51 (34.9)	37 (25.3	41 (32.3)	42 (33.1)	44 (34.6)	60 (44.8)	35 (26.1)	39 (29.1)
Minor-Leschi	25 (34.7)	38 (52.8)	9 (12.5)	12 (18.2)	22 (33.3)	32 (48.5)	22 (38.6)	26 (45.6)	9 (15.8)	15 (28.3)	18 (34.0)	20 (37.7)	20 (37.7)	14 (26.4)	19 (35.8)
Georgetown	17 (20.7)	49 (59.8)	16 (19.5)	2 (3.4)	14 (24.1)	42 (72.4)	6 (10.9)	38 (69.1)	11 (20.0)	6 (11.5)	41 (78.8)	5 (9.6)	11 (20.4)[2]	28 (51.9)	15 (27.8)
Concord	21 (25.6)	46 (56.1)	15 (18.3)	7 (10.0)	13 (18.6)	50 (71.4)	14 (26.4)	31 (58.5)	8 (15.1)	17 (33.3)	21 (41.2)	13 (25.5)	1 (2.0)[2]	32 (65.3)	16 (32.7)
Decatur	14 (15.7)	71 (79.8)	4 (4.5)	28 (37.8)[3]	36 (48.6)	10 (13.5)	16 (21.6)	55 (74.3)	3 (4.1)	20 (30.8)	41 (63.1)	4 (6.2)	0	42 (63.6)	24 (36.4)
Maple Leaf	14 (15.7)	53 (59.6)	22 (24.7)	14 (19.7)[3]	45 (63.4)	12 (16.9)	17 (21.5)	56 (70.9)	6 (7.6)	22 (29.7)	47 (63.5)	5 (6.8)	1 (1.4)	47 (64.4)	25 (34.2)
Summit	12 (14.6)	59 (72.0)	11 (13.4)	7 (13.7)	13 (25.5)	31 (60.8)	8 (21.6)	23 (62.2)	6 (16.2)	13 (40.6)	18 (56.3)	1 (3.1)	4 (14.3)	16 (57.1)	8 (28.6)

---

[1] These questions are Nos. 12, 16 (and 17), 23, 24, and 25 in the household questionnaire.

[2] Difference between Georgetown and Concord significant at .01; T=3.24.

[3] Significant difference between Decatur and Maple Leaf at .02; T=2.55.

APPENDIX TABLE: OTHER PERCEIVED NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGES [1]

Number and (percent) mentioning item:

	Age of residents--		Number of minorities--		Socio-Economic Status--		Number of Children--		Number of Owner-Occupied Homes--		Amount Industrial--		Number Multi-Family Residences--		Activity of Community Groups--		Community Spirit--	
	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED	IN-CREASED	DE-CREASED
Interlake	3 (1.3)	31 (13.2)	14 (6.0)	0	1 (0.4)	5 (2.1)	7 (2.9)	6 (2.5)	4 (1.7)	13 (5.6)	6 (2.5)	1 (0.4)	2 (2.0)	0	1 (0.4)	0	3 (1.2)	2 (0.8)
Allen	1 (1.0)	12 (12.4)	6 (6.2)	0	1 (1.0)	2 (2.0)	2 (2.0)	4 (4.0)	0	5 (5.1)	1 (1.0)	0	0	1 (1.0)	0	0	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)
Main	10 (4.9)	11 (5.4)	14 (6.9)	1 (0.5)	10 (4.9)	2 (1.0)	9 (4.4)	6 (2.9)	8 (4.0)	9 (4.4)	5 (2.5)	5 (2.5)	8 (4.0)	3 (1.5)	1 (0.5)	0	4 (2.0)	3 (1.5)
Minor-Leschi	1 (1.1)	4 (4.3)	2 (2.2)	2 (2.2)	0	0	0	0	2 (2.2)	2 (2.2)	3 (3.3)	2 (2.2)	4 (4.3)	0	2 (2.2)	0	2 (2.2)	0
Georgetown	2 (2.2)	3 (3.3)	6 (6.7)	0	0	4 (4.5)	1 (1.1)	0	0	11 (12.4)	26 (29.2)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	0	0	1 (1.1)	0
Concord	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	0	0	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	19 (20.4)	0	3 (3.3)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.3)	0	1 (1.1)	0
Decatur	2 (2.2)	7 (7.5)	4 (4.3)	0	0	0	2 (2.2)	5 (5.4)	5 (5.4)	1 (1.0)	4 (4.3)	0	2 (2.2)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.2)	0	0	0
Maple Leaf	6 (6.3)	7 (7.3)	11 (11.5)	0	1 (1.0)	1 (1.0)	5 (5.4)	7 (7.3)	6 (6.3)	5 (5.4)	1 (1.0)	0	0	0	0	0	3 (3.2)	1 (1.0)
Summit	2 (2.1)	3 (3.2)	5 (5.3)	1 (1.0)	2 (2.1)	2 (2.1)	1 (1.0)	2 (2.1)	0	3 (3.2)	9 (9.5)	1 (1.0)	2 (2.1)	1 (1.0)	0	3 (3.2)	0	3 (3.2)

[1] This is question 26 in the household questionnaire.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER V

APPENDIX TABLE: MOVE IF SCHOOL QUALITY DECREASED[1]

Number of responses and (percent of total):

	Would want to move	Would actually move
Interlake	58 (25.4)	20 (34.5)
Allen	25 (26.9)	13 (52.0)
Mann	46 (23.4)	24 (52.2)
Minor-Leschi	18 (19.8)	13 (72.2)
Georgetown	20 (23.5)	17 (85.0)
Concord	23 (25.6)	13 (56.5)
Decatur	33 (35.9)	19 (57.6)
Maple Leaf	33 (34.7)	14 (42.4)
Summit	18 (19.6)	12 (66.7)

---

[1] Questions 4 and 5 in interview.

APPENDIX TABLE: MOVE IF SCHOOL CLOSED[1]

	Number of responses and (percent of total):	
	Would want to move	Would actually move
Interlake	37 (15.9)	20 (54.1)
Allen	14 (14.9)	8 (57.1)
Mann	39 (19.3)	27 (69.2)
Minor-Leschi	12 (13.3)	9 (75.0)
Georgetown	17 (18.5)	13 (76.4)
Concord	19 (20.4)	13 (68.4)
Decatur	17 (18.5)	9 (52.9)
Maple Leaf	9 (9.5)	1 (11.1)
Summit	7 (7.7)	3 (42.9)

---

[1] Questions 4 and 5 in interview.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VI

APPENDIX TABLE: How good a job are public elementary schools doing?[1]

Number of responses and (row percentages):

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DON'T KNOW
Interlake	12 (5.1)	54 (23.0)	52 (22.1)	12 (5.1)	105 (44.7)
Allen	6 (6.8)	16 (16.5)	21 (21.6)	7 (7.2)	47 (48.5)
Mann	18 (8.8)	55 (26.9)	49 (23.9)	14 (6.8)	69 (33.7)
Minor-Leschi	11 (12.0)	17 (18.5)	15 (16.3)	5 (5.4)	44 (47.8)
Georgetown	2 (2.2)	16 (18.0)	11 (12.4)	8 (9.0)	52 (58.4)
Concord	8 (8.6)	18 (19.4)	10 (10.8)	11 (11.8)	46 (49.5)
Decatur	12 (12.9)	27 (29.0)	12 (12.9)	3 (3.2)	39 (41.9)
Maple Leaf	8 (8.3)	31 (32.3)	25 (26.0)	3 (3.1)	29 (30.2)
Summit	1 (1.1)	13 (13.7)	9 (9.5)	7 (7.4)	65 (68.4)

---

[1] Question 32 in interview.

APPENDIX TABLE: **IMPORTANT ASPECTS OF EDUCATION**[1]

Number of responses and (row percentages):

	Basic Skills	Discipline	Walking Distance	Individualized Instruction	Friendly Atmosphere	Good Teachers	Other
Interlake	65 (27.7)	10 (4.3)	2 (0.9)	7 (3.0)	17 (7.2)	133 (56.6)	1 (0.4)
Allen	24 (24.7)	5 (5.2)	1 (1.0)	4 (4.1)	5 (5.2)	54 (55.7)	4 (4.1)
Mann	40 (19.5)	25 (12.2)	5 (2.4)	5 (2.4)	10 (4.9)	113 (55.1)	7 (3.4)
Minor-Leschi	22 (23.9)	12 (13.0)	0	5 (5.4)	8 (8.7)	44 (47.8)	1 (1.1)
Georgetown	20 (22.5)	11 (12.4)	1 (1.1)	4 (4.5)	6 (6.7)	46 (51.7)	1 (1.1)
Concord	23 (24.7)	6 (6.5)	4 (4.3)	4 (4.3)	8 (8.6)	48 (51.6)	0
Decatur	21 (22.6)	8 (8.6)	2 (2.2)	2 (2.2)	0	60 (64.5)	0
Maple Leaf	25 (26.0)	5 (5.2)	1 (1.0)	6 (6.3)	7 (7.3)	52 (54.5)	0
Summit	35 (36.8)	7 (7.4)	1 (1.1)	5 (5.3)	3 (3.2)	44 (46.3)	0

---

[1] Question 31 in interview.

APPENDIX TABLE: CHANGE IN QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS SINCE CLOSURE YEAR[1]

Number or responses and (row percentage):

	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	DON'T KNOW
Interlake	23. (9.8)	43 (18.3)	30 (12.8)	139 (59.1)
Allen	11 (4.7)	18 (7.7)	18 (7.7)	50 (51.5)
Mann	56 (27.5)	26 (12.7)	38 (18.6)	85 (41.7)
Minor-Leschi	22 (23.9)	7 (7.6)	7 (7.6)	56 (60.9)
Georgetown	6 (6.7)	12 (13.5)	15 (16.9)	56 (60.9)
Concord	11 (11.8)	16 (17.4)	12 (12.9)	54 (58.1)
Decatur	12 (12.9)	20 (21.5)	14 (15.1)	47 (50.5)
Maple Leaf	13 (13.5)	23 (24.0)	22 (22.9)	38 (39.6)
Summit	14 (14.7)	6 (6.3)	9 (9.5)	66 (69.5)

---

[1] Question 33 in interview.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VII

APPENDIX TABLE: MOST IMPORTANT PLACES IN NEIGHBORHOOD FOR MEETINGS OR GETTING TOGETHER[1]

Number and (row percentage):

NEIGHBORHOODS	Church	Public School	Other School	Shopping Area	Bar/ Restaurant	Recreation Center	Other
Interlake	15 (27.8)	1 (1.9)	4 (7.4)	2 (3.7)	13 (24.1)	10 (18.5)	9 (16.7)
Allen	10 (22.7)	5 (11.4)	0 --	1 (2.3)	9 (20.5)	12 (27.3)	7 (15.9)
Mann	33 (40.7)	3 (3.7)	2 (2.5)	1 (1.2)	4 (4.9)	20 (24.7)	18 (22.2)
Minor-Leschi	10 (27.0)	2 (5.4)	5 (13.5)	1 (2.7)	3 (8.1)	10 (27.0)	6 (16.2)
Georgetown	6 (20.7)	1 (3.4)	7 (24.1)	0 --	4 (13.8)	4 (13.8)	7 (24.1)
Concord	2 (5.9)	2 (5.9)	0 --	0 --	4 (11.8)	24 (70.6)	2 (5.9)
Decatur	18 (54.5)	10 (30.3)	0 --	0 --	5 (15.2)	0 --	0 --
Maple Leaf	6 (17.1)	2 (5.7)	14 (40.0)	0 --	1 (2.9)	6 (17.1)	6 (17.1)
Summit	6 (23.1)	0 --	4 (15.4)	2 (7.7)	5 (19.2)	7 (26.9)	2 (7.7)

---

[1] Interview question 20; answered only by those answering yes to 19.

APPENDIX TABLE:

ATTENDANCE AT MEETINGS IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS[1]

Number attending type of meeting in last year and (percent of total):

NEIGHBORHOODS	PTSA	School Related Social Fund Raising	Citizens' Advisory Groups, etc.	Youth Groups	Adult Education	Recreational Activities	Pre-School	Religious/ Political Organization
Interlake	19 (8.1)	21 (8.9)	11 (4.7)	2 (0.9)	0 --	7 (3.0)	1 (0.4)	1 (0.4)
Allen	8 (8.2)	5 (5.2)	5 (5.2)	4 (4.1)	1 (1.0)	2 (2.1)	0 --	1 (1.0)
Mann	31 (15.1)	20 (9.8)	15 (7.3)	3 (1.5)	2 (1.0)	7 (3.4)	1 (0.5)	1 (0.5)
Minor-Leschi	11 (12.0)	6 (6.5)	4 (4.3)	0 --	0 --	3 (3.3)	0 --	1 (1.1)
Georgetown	7 (7.9)	5 (5.6)	2 (2.2)	0 --	0 --	2 (2.2)	0 --	0 --
Concord	7 (7.5)	11 (11.8)	4 (4.3)	0 --	0 --	5 (5.4)	0 --	1 (1.1)
Decatur	13 (14.0)	18 (19.4)	9 (9.7)	7 (7.5)	1 (1.1)	3 (3.2)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)
Maple Leaf	13 (13.5)	13 (13.5)	0 --	6 (6.3)	0 --	6 (6.3)	0 --	0 --
Summit	2 (2.1)	1 (1.1)	1 (1.1)	0 --	0 --	0 --	1 (1.1)	0 --

---

[1] Interview question 40.

APPENDIX TABLE: ACTIVITIES THAT RESPONDENTS THINK OUGHT TO TAKE PLACE IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS[1]

Number and (percent of total) who mention each activity:

NEIGHBORHOOD	PTSA	School Related Social/ Fund Raising	Citizens' Advisory Groups	Youth Groups	Recreational Activities	Pre-school /Day Care	Religious/ Political Meeting	Adult Education	Other Education	Other Meetings
Interlake	48 (20.4)	18 (7.7)	73 (31.1)	28 (11.9)	35 (14.9)	10 (4.3)	15 (6.4)	38 (16.2)	18 (7.7)	32 (13.6)
Allen	19 (19.6)	12 (12.4)	31 (32.0)	17 (17.5)	15 (15.5)	1 (1.0)	7 (7.2)	13 (13.4)	9 (9.3)	10 (10.3)
Mann	53 (25.9)	26 (12.7)	27 (13.2)	10 (4.9)	20 (9.8)	0 --	4 (2.0)	7 (3.4)	6 (2.9)	9 (4.4)
Minor-Leschi	22 (24.2)	5 (5.4)	12 (13.0)	5 (5.4)	11 (12.0)	1 (1.1)	2 (2.2)	7 (7.6)	5 (5.4)	1 (1.1)
Georgetown	21 (23.6)	3 (3.4)	14 (15.7)	4 (4.5)	8 (9.0)	2 (2.2)	0 --	3 (3.4)	2 (2.2)	4 (4.5)
Concord	20 (21.5)	12 (12.9)	16 (17.2)	6 (6.5)	22 (23.7)	3 (3.2)	6 (6.5)	13 (14.0)	13 (14.0)	6 (6.5)
Decatur	24 (25.8)	8 (8.6)	28 (30.1)	16 (17.2)	24 (25.8)	1 (1.1)	10 (10.8)	19 (20.4)	7 (7.5)	7 (7.7)
Maple Leaf	17 (17.9)	9 (9.4)	23 (24.0)	17 (17.7)	11 (11.5)	7 (7.3)	4 (4.2)	7 (7.3)	7 (7.3)	5 (5.2)
Summit	17 (17.9)	11 (11.6)	24 (9.7)	2 (2.1)	7 (7.4)	4 (4.2)	1 (1.1)	12 (12.6)	4 (4.2)	4 (4.2)

---

[1] Interview question 42.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER VIII

APPENDIX TABLE: PERCEIVED DIRECT EFFECTS OF ACTUAL SCHOOL CLOSURE[1,2]

CHANGE	NEIGHBORHOOD Interlake	 Mann	 Georgetown	 Summit
People to move out of neighborhood	36 (42.4)	42 (45.7)	22 (55.0)	5 (50.0)
Property values to go down	16 (17.6)	32 (34.8)	14 (32.6)	3 (33.3)
Crime in neighborhood to increase	16 (17.6)	39 (43.8)	2 (4.8)	3 (37.5)
People to show less concern for neighborhood	19 (19.4)	34 (34.0)	16 (38.1)	2 (25.0)
People find new place for meetings	23 (29.9)	49 (55.1)	14 (38.9)	3 (42.9)
Amount of business or industry to increase	7 (7.1)	11 (11.7)	20 (44.4)	3 (42.9)
Type of people moving in to change	34 (35.1)	36 (38.3)	14 (36.8)	6 (75.0)

---

[1] Question 46 in the interview.

[2] Only closure residents who were there at time of closure responded to this question; percentages only reflect those answering that particular item.

APPENDIX TABLE: PERCEIVED CHANGE OF EDUCATIONAL QUALITY SINCE CLOSURE [1,2]

Number of responses and (row percentage):

	BETTER	SAME	WORSE
Interlake	2 (4.2)	34 (70.8)	12 (25.0)
Mann	13 (21.0)	31 (50.0)	18 (29.0)
Georgetown	2 (11.8)	10 (58.8)	5 (29.4)
Summit	0	2 (50.0)	2 (50.0)

---

[1] Interview question 47.
[2] Asked only of tenured closures.

APPENDIX TABLE:

PERCEIVED POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF CLOSING A NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL

Number and (percent) who indicated that these effects would be caused by school closure:

CHANGE	NEIGHBORHOOD ALLEN	MINOR-LESCHI	CONCORD	MAPLE LEAF	DECATUR
People to move out of neighborhood	82 (90.1)	62 (73.8)	75 (83.3)	72 (80.0)	72 (80.0)
Property values to go down	57 (67.1)	51 (65.4)	61 (76.3)	60 (66.7)	55 (66.3)
Crime in neighborhood to increase	22 (26.5)	37 (49.3)	35 (42.7)	30 (38.5)	22 (29.3)
People who live there to show less concern	24 (27.0)	48 (57.8)	43 (51.2)	33 (38.4)	32 (38.1)
The amount of business or industry to increase	22 (26.8)	21 (28.4)	35 (43.8)	19 (24.4)	15 (18.1)
The type of people moving into the neighborhood to change	82 (89.1)	60 (75.0)	68 (79.1)	82 (91.1)	74 (82.2)
The quality of education to drop	58 (68.2)	60 (71.4)	60 (69.0)	54 (60.0)	46 (52.3)

---

[1] Question 48 in the interview.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER IX

APPENDIX TABLE: PEOPLE WHO VOTED IN LAST SCHOOL LEVY ELECTION[1]

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	
Interlake	100	42.7	(T=1.72)
Allen	51	53.1	
Mann	87	43.3	
Minor-Leschi	37	40.7	
Georgetown	28	31.8	
Concord	24	25.8	
Decatur	63	67.7	
Maple Leaf	66	69.5	
Summit	31	33.3	

---

[1] Interview question 69.

APPENDIX TABLE: AMONG THOSE WHO VOTED, HOW MANY VOTED YES[1]

	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE[2]
Interlake	59	(64.8)
Allen	33	(73.3)
Mann	66	(85.7)
Minor-Leschi	32	(91.4)
Georgetown	7	(35.0)
Concord	16	(69.6)
Decatur	47	(82.5)
Maple-Leaf	50	(82.0)
Summit	20	(69.0)

---

[1] Question 70 in interview.

[2] Based on those who answered either yes or no.

APPENDIX TABLE: HOW MUCH THEY FOLLOW RECENT CLOSURE NEWS[1]

Number and (row percentage);

	VERY CLOSELY	SOMEWHAT CLOSELY	A LITTLE BIT	NOT AT ALL
Interlake	50 (21.3)	95 (40.4)	66 (28.1)	24 (10.2)
Allen	10 (10.3)	38 (39.2)	37 (38.1)	12 (12.4)
Mann	50 (24.4)	59 (28.8)	62 (30.2)	34 (16.6)
Minor-Leschi	15 (16.3)	34 (37.0)	32 (34.8)	11 (12.0)
Georgetown	14 (16.1)	31 (35.6)	22 (25.3)	20 (23.0)
Concord	9 (9.7)	30 (32.3)	32 (34.4)	22 (23.7)
Decatur	28 (30.1)	34 (36.6)	24 (25.8)	7 (7.5)
Maple-Leaf	23 (24.0)	41 (42.7)	30 (31.3)	2 (2.1)
Summit	12 (12.8)	27 (28.7)	31 (33.0)	24 (25.5)

---

[1] Interview question 68.

APPENDIX: SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

Mathematica Policy Research
Seattle, Washington

ID Number ☐☐ - ☐☐☐ $\frac{1}{6}$
1 2 3 4 5

Address:____.

Interviewer:__________________________I.D.:__________

Time Began ☐☐ : ☐☐ AM. . . . 1
PM. . . . 2

COMP. TIME ☐☐☐ MIN.
7 8 9

Hello, my name is ______________________, from Mathematica Policy Research. We are conducting a survey for the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public Schools to find out people's opinions about the neighborhoods they live in and about schools and education. Your address was randomly selected to represent people like you in Seattle. It's important that we get your opinions, whether or not you have children. All information will be held confidential and will only be used to produce statistical reports. The interview takes about 20 minutes. We would appreciate your help in this study.

1. When did you first move into this house (apartment)? ☐ ☐
10 11

2. Why did you move out of your last residence?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:

WORK:		
DISTANCE FROM WORK	1	12
OTHER WORK-RELATED	1	13
HOUSING:		
STRUCTURE (LACKED DESIRED FEATURES)	1	14
FINANCIAL (COULDN'T AFFORD RENT)	1	15
SCHOOLS:		
DISSATISFIED WITH QUALITY	1	16
DISSATISFIED WITH DISTANCE	1	17
NEIGHBORHOOD:		
CRIME	1	18
ACCESS TO SHOPPING	1	19
ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION	1	20
NEIGHBORHOOD CHANGING	1	21
PERSONAL:	1	22
OTHER: ______________________________		
______________________________	1	23

3. Why did you choose this neighborhood?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:

WORK-RELATED:

DISTANCE................................ 1 24

OTHER WORK-RELATED.................. 1 25

HOUSING:

STRUCTURE (FOUND RIGHT PLACE)....... 1 26

FINANCIAL (FOUND RIGHT PLACE)........ 1 27

SCHOOLS:

BETTER.................................. 1 28

CLOSER.................................. 1 29

NEIGHBORHOOD:

SAFER.................................... 1 30

ACCESS TO SHOPS, PUBLIC FACILITIES... 1 31

BETTER TRANSPORTATION............... 1 32

VIEW--OTHER GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES............................ 1 33

SIMILAR NEIGHBORS..................... 1 34

NEIGHBORLINESS/COMMUNITY SPIRIT..... 1 35

PERSONAL................................ 1 36

OTHER:______________________________

______________________________ 1 37

4. We're interested in the kinds of changes in neighborhoods that might cause people to move. Would your household want to move if·

5. IF "YES" TO ITEM "C" OR "E" ONLY, ASK: Do you think you would actually move if:

	(Q.4) WANT TO MOVE?			(Q.5) IF YES TO 'C' OR 'E': WOULD MOVE?
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
A. the amount of industry nearby increased?	1 38	2	D	
B. more places in the neighborhood were rented out, rather than occupied by their owners?	1 39	2	D	
C. any of the schools in the neighborhoods closed?	1 40	2	D	YES...... 1 NO....... 2 44
D. the kind of people living in the neighborhood changed?	1 41	2	D	
E. the quality of the schools in the neighborhood decreased?	1 42	2	D	YES.......1 NO........2 45
F. property values went down?	1 43	2	D	

6. Here is a list of things that may be important in making a neighborhood a good place to live. Do you think (ITEM) is not too important, somewhat important or very important to you?

7. IF MORE THAN 3 "VERY IMPORTANT", ASK, Which of those that were "very important" are the 3 most important to you? Here's a card to remind you of the choices. HAND CARD.

8. IF MORE THAN ONE "MOST IMPORTANT," ASK, Which of those 3 is the single most important to you?

	(Q.6)			(Q.7)	(Q.8)	
	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	3 MOST IMPORTANT	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT	
a. Convenience to shopping........	1	2	3	4	5	46
b. A low crime rate in the area......	1	2	3	4	5	47
c. Neighbors who help each other out............	1	2	3	4	5	48
d. The quality of schools in the area...........	1	2	3	4	5	49
e. Convenience to work...........	1	2	3	4	5	50
f. Neighbors who are similar to you and your family......	1	2	3	4	5	51
g. Schools that are within walking distance.........	1	2	3	4	5	52
h. Convenience to public transportation...........	1	2	3	4	5	53
i. Convenience to parks and recreation areas......	1	2	3	4	5	54

9. All in all, how satisfied are you with this neighborhood as a place to live? Would you say:

Very satisfied,	1	
somewhat satisfied,	2	55
somewhat dissatisfied, or,	3	
very dissatisfied?	4	

SEE LABEL ON COVER FOR "NUMBER OF YEARS" FOR Q.10-37. IF RESPONDENT HAS LIVED HERE LESS THAN (NUMBER) YEARS, ASK Q.10-37 "since you moved here". IF RESPONDENT HAS LIVED HERE (NUMBER) YEARS OR MORE, ASK Q.10-37 "over the last (NUMBER) years or so."

10. Overall, what has happened to this neighborhood as a place to live (over the last (NUMBER) years)(since you moved here)? Has it:

improved,	1	
stayed the same, or,	2	56
gotten worse?	3	
DON'T KNOW	D	

11. Is this the kind of neighborhood where neighbors help each other out?

YES	1	
NO	2	57
DON'T KNOW	D	

12. Do neighbors help each other out more, the same, or less than they did (NUMBER) of years ago (when you first moved here)?

MORE	1	
SAME	2	
LESS	3	58
DON'T KNOW	D	

13. For the next part of the interview, when I talk about "this area", I mean (SHOW MAP, POINT OUT MAIN STREETS AND LANDMARKS. LOCATE RESPONDENT'S HOME ON MAP. When you answer the next few questions, please answer only about the area I just showed you. If you think you can't answer for the whole area, it's okay if you answer about just the part you know about. Just don't tell me about anything outside the area on the map.

Do most, some, or a few, people in this area keep up their property?

MOST	1	
SOME	2	
FEW	3	59
DON'T KNOW	D	

14. How often do crimes like burglary and vandalism happen in this area --would you say:

a lot,	1	
some, or	2	
a little?	3	60
DON'T KNOW	D	

15. How many vacant houses (or apartments) do you know of in this area --would you say:

a lot, ... 1

some, ... 2

a few, or 3 61

none 4

DON'T KNOW .... D

16. Would you say property values in this area are:

going up, ... 1

staying the same, or .....*GO TO Q. 18*....... 2

62

going down? ....*GO TO Q. 18*........ 3

DON'T KNOW............*GO TO Q. 18*........ D

17. Would you say the property values here are:

going up faster than those in the city as a whole, .. 1

going up at the same rate, or.................... 2

63

going up at a slower rate? 3

DON'T KNOW .... D

18. How many of your friends and social activities are in this area? Would you say:

all, ... 1

most, ... 2

64

a few, or 3

none? 4

19. Are there any places in the area on the map where you have meetings or just get together with your neighbors?

YES.................................... 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q. 21*....... 2 65

DON'T KNOW........... *GO TO Q. 21*....... D

20. What is it? (Which one is most important to your household?)
●PROBE FOR TYPE OF SCHOOL, IF MENTIONED.
CIRCLE ONE:

CHURCH.................................... 1

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL............... 2

OTHER SCHOOL............................. 3

SHOPPING AREA/LAUNDROMAT.............. 4 66

BAR/RESTAURANT.......................... 5

PARK/RECREATION CENTER/CLUB.......... 6

OTHER: ______________________________ 7

21. Are there any community groups or organizations in this neighborhood that are concerned with neighborhood issues?

YES 1

NO...................................... 2 67

DON'T KNOW............................. D

22. CIRCLE ONE (SEE Q. 1)

RESPONDENT HAS LIVED HERE
LESS THAN 2 YEARS................*GO TO Q. 30*........ 1

RESPONDENT HAS LIVED HERE 2 YEARS OR MORE........ 2

SEE LABEL ON COVER FOR "NUMBER OF YEARS" FOR Q. 23-28.

23. Now I'd like to ask how this neighborhood might have changed (over the last (NUMBER) of years or so)(since you moved in).

Do people in this neighborhood now keep up their property more, the same, or less than the people who lived here (NUMBER) years ago (when you moved here)?

MORE	1	
SAME	2	
LESS	3	68
DON'T KNOW	D	

24. Is the crime rate in this neighborhood higher, about the same, or lower than it was (NUMBER) years ago (when you moved here)?

HIGHER	1	
SAME	2	
LOWER	3	69
DON'T KNOW	D	

25. Are there more, the same, or less vacant houses (and apartments) than there were (NUMBER) or so years ago (when you moved here)?

MORE	1	
SAME	2	
LESS	3	70
DON'T KNOW	D	

26. Is there anything (else) about this neighborhood that you think has changed (over the last (NUMBER) years or so)(since you moved here)--things like the kind of people who live here, the way the land is used, and so on?

YES:		INCREASED	DECREASED
AGE OF RESIDENTS................	71	1	2
NUMBER OF MINORITIES...........	72	1	2
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF RESIDENTS.........................	73	1	2
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN NEIGHBORHOOD........................	74	1	2
NUMBER OF OWNER-OCCUPIED HOMES............................	75	1	2
AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL USE OF LAND...............	76	1	2
NUMBER OF MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCES......................	77	1	2
ACTIVITY OF COMMUNITY GROUPS	78	1	2
COMMUNITY SPIRIT OF RESIDENTS	79	1	2
OTHER:____________________	80	1	2

Card 2 ☐☐☐-☐☐☐ 1-5 2 6

NO.....................................1 7

27. CIRCLE ONE:

RESPONDENT MENTIONED AT LEAST ONE CHANGE IN Q.23-26...1

RESPONDENT MENTIONED NO CHANGES...*GO TO Q.29*........ 2

28. What do you think caused (those changes)(that to change)?

CLOSURE OF SCHOOLS...................... 1

OTHER (SPECIFY):______________________ 8

____ 2

29. Here is a list of things that might be important in giving elementary school age children a good education. Do you think (ITEM) is not too important, somewhat important, or very important in giving elementary school children a good education?

30. IF MORE THAN THREE "VERY IMPORTANT", ASK: Which of those do you think are the three most important? Here's a card to remind you of the choices.

31. IF MORE THAN ONE "MOST IMPORTANT", ASK: Which of those is the most important to you?

	(Q. 29)			(Q. 30)	(Q. 31)	
	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	3 MOST IMPORTANT	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT	
a. Teaching the basic skills.......	1	2	3	4	5	9
b. Strict discipline...	1	2	3	4	5	10
c. Attending a school within walking distance from home..	1	2	3	4	5	11
d. Individualized instruction.......	1	2	3	4	5	12
e. A friendly atmosphere in the school	1	2	3	4	5	13
f. Good teachers....	1	3	3	4	5	14

32. All in all, how good a job are the public elementary schools in this neighborhood doing today--would you say:

excellent,	1	
good	2	
fair, or	3	15
poor?	4	
DON'T KNOW	D	

33. On the whole, are they doing better, the same, or worse than they were doing (NUMBER) years ago or so?

BETTER	1	
SAME	2	16
WORSE	3	
DON'T KNOW	D	

34. CIRCLE ONE:

RESPONDENT ANSWERED "DON'T KNOW" TO BOTH Q. 32 AND Q. 33	*GO TO Q. 38*	1
RESPONDENT GAVE AN ANSWER OTHER THAN "DON'T KNOW" TO Q. 32 OR Q. 33		2

35. Now, thinking about the education the children in this neighborhood receive in the public elementary schools, would you say (ITEM) is excellent, good, fair, or poor? CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH ITEM "a"-"e" ON GRID. IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS DON'T KNOW TO 2 OR MORE ITEMS, OR INDICATES (S)HE DOESN'T KNOW ABOUT SCHOOLS, CIRCLE "D" FOR REMAINING ITEMS, AND GO TO Q. 38.

36. CIRCLE ONE (SEE Q. 1):

FAMILY HAS LIVED HERE TWO OR MORE YEARS........... 1

FAMILY HAS LIVED HERE LESS THAN TWO YEARS........................ *GO TO Q. 38*........ 2

37. Now I'd like you to compare those things to the education the children in this neighborhood were receiving (NUMBER) years ago or so) (when you first moved here). Is (ITEM) better, the same, or worse than it was then?

	(Q. 35)					(Q. 37)			
	EXCELLENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DON'T KNOW	BETTER	SAME	WORSE	DON'T KNOW
a. the subjects they are taught	1 17	2	3	4	D	1 22	2	3	D
b. the way they are disciplined...	1 18	2	3	4	D	1 23	2	3	D
c. the distance they travel to school..	1 19	2	3	4	D	1 24	2	3	D
d. after-school programs that are offered..	1 20	2	3	4	D	1 25	2	3	D
e. the quality of the teachers	1 21	2	3	4	D	1 26	2	3	D

38. In the last year has any one in your household attended any meetings or other activities that were held in a public elementary school building?

YES.. 1

NO..................... *GO TO Q. 41*........ 2 27

DON'T KNOW .... *GO TO Q. 41*........ D

39. What kinds of activities were these? FOR EACH ASK:

40. Who attended that meeting (activity)--was it adults, junior or senior high school-aged children, or younger children?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:	(Q. 43)	(Q. 44)		
	TYPE	ADULTS	HIGH SCHOOL	YOUNGER CHILDREN
PTSA...........................	1	1 28	2 29	3 30
SCHOOL-RELATED SOCIAL OR FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES......	2	1 31	2 32	3 33
CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCILS, COMMUNITY GROUPS............	3	1 34	2 35	3 36
SCOUTS, CAMPFIRE GIRLS, YOUTH GROUPS.................	4	1 37	2 38	3 39
ADULT ED./NIGHT SCHOOL......	5	1 40	2 41	3 42
PARK DEPT., RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....................	6	1 43	2 44	3 45
PRE-SCHOOL, DAY CARE........	7	1 46	2 47	3 48
RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL ORGS....	8	1 49	2 50	3 51
OTHER EDUCATIONAL: ______________________________	9	1 52	2 53	3 54
OTHER MEETINGS:	10	1	2	3

41. Are there any (other) activities or meetings that you think ought to take place in the public elementary schools?

YES	1	
		58
NO .... *GO TO Q. 43*	2	

42. What are they?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:

PTSA	1	59
SCHOOL-RELATED SOCIAL OR FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES	1	60
CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCILS, COMMUNITY GROUPS	1	61
SCOUTS, CAMPFIRE GIRLS, YOUTH GROUPS	1	62
ADULT ED. /NIGHT SCHOOL	1	63
PARK DEPT., RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES	1	64
PRE-SCHOOL, DAY CARE	1	65
RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS	1	66
OTHER EDUCATIONAL: ____________________		
____________________	1	67
OTHER MEETINGS: ____________________		
____________________	1	68

** GO TO Q. 44 **

43. Should public schools be used for other activities besides educating children?

YES	1	
NO	2	59
DON'T KNOW	D	

44. CIRCLE ONE (SEE LABEL):

RESPONDENT IS IN CLOSURE SAMPLE.................... 1

RESPONDENT IS IN CONTROL OR THREATENED
CLOSURE SAMPLE................ *GO TO Q. 48*........ 2

45. SEE LABEL ON COVER FOR "YEAR" FOR Q. 46-47. CIRCLE ONE (SEE Q. 1):

RESPONDENT LIVED HERE IN (YEAR).................... 1

RESPONDENT DID NOT LIVE
HERE IN (YEAR)................... *GO TO Q. 48*....... 2

46. You may remember that (NEIGHBORHOOD) school closed in (YEAR). I'd like to ask you a few questions about some effects that might have had on the area on the map. (Here it is to remind you.) Did closing the school cause:

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
people to move out of the neighborhood?	1	2	D	70
property values to go down?..........	1	2	D	71
crime in the neighborhood to increase?	1	2	D	72
people who lived here to show less concern for the neighborhood?........	1	2	D	73
people in the community to find a new place to hold meetings?.............	1	2	D	74
the amount of business or industry in the area to increase?...............	1	2	D	75
the type of people moving in to change?	1	2	D	76

47. Was the education the children from this neighborhood received after (SCHOOL) closed better, about the same, or worse than it was before the school closed?

BETTER....................................	1	
SAME....................................	2	77
WORSE....................................	3	
DON'T KNOW....................................	D	

Card 3 ☐☐ – ☐☐☐ 3
1 2 3 4 5 6

GO TO Q. 50

48. You may have heard that in the past 10 years, the Seattle Public Schools have closed elementary schools in some neighborhoods. I'd like to ask you a few questions about some effects closing the school might have on the neighborhood around the school.

Would closing a neighborhood elementary school cause:

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
people to move out of the neighborhood? ...	1	2	D	7
property values to go down?	1	2	D	8
crime in the neighborhood to increase?	1	2	D	9
people who live there to show less concern for the neighborhood?	1	2	D	10
the amount of business or industry to increase?	1	2	D	11
the type of people moving into the neighborhood to change?	1	2	D	12
the quality of education to drop?	1	2	D	13

49. If (NEIGHBORHOOD) school closed, do you think any children in your household might go to a private or parochial school?

YES.. 1
ALREADY IN PRIVATE SCHOOL.................. 2
NO CHILDREN IN HOUSEHOLD................... 3 14
NO... 4
DON'T KNOW................................. D

50. Is the presence of an elementary school in this neighborhood a good thing or a bad thing for you?

GOOD....................................... 1
BAD.. 2 15
NEITHER/DON'T CARE......................... 3

51. Now I'd like to ask a few questions about you and your household.

Other than you, how many adults are currently living in your household? ☐☐ 16 17

NONE.................. *GO TO Q.53*....... 00

52. What are the ages of the other adults?

1..... ☐☐ 18 19
2..... ☐☐ 20 21
3..... ☐☐ 22 23
4..... ☐☐ 24 25
5..... ☐☐ 26 27

53. How old are you? ☐☐ 28 29

54. Are there any children in your household?

YES.. 1

NO..................... *GO TO Q. 62*....... 2

30

55. What are their ages?

1..... ☐☐ 31 32

2..... ☐☐ 33 34

3..... ☐☐ 35 36

4..... ☐☐ 37 38

5..... ☐☐ 39 40

6..... ☐☐ 41 42

7..... ☐☐ 43 44

8..... ☐☐ 45 46

9..... ☐☐ 47 48

10..... ☐☐ 49 50

56. ARE THERE ANY CHILDREN AGES 5-12?

YES.. 1

NO..................... *GO TO Q. 62*....... 2

57. (Is this child)(Are some or all of the children aged 5-12) enrolled in a public elementary school?

ALL ARE.. 1

SOME ARE.. 2

NO...................... *GO TO Q. 60*....... 3 51

DON'T KNOW........... *GO TO Q. 60*....... D

58. (Does he or she)(Do some or all of the children enrolled in public elementary school) attend school in this neighborhood?

ALL DO... 1

SOME DO... 2

NO.. 3 52

DON'T KNOW.....................................D

59. CIRCLE ONE:

THERE ARE CHILDREN AGED 5-12 WHO ARE NOT IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL..............................1

THERE ARE NO CHILDREN AGED 5-12 WHO ARE NOT IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL... *GO TO Q. 62*........ 2

60. Is this child (Are any of these children aged 5-12) enrolled in a private or parochial school?

YES... 1

NO...................... *GO TO Q. 62*........ 2 53

DON'T KNOW............*GO TO Q. 62*........ D

61. Why is he (she)(are they) enrolled in private school?

CIRCLE ONLY ONE:

WANTED RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.............. 1
BETTER ACADEMIC EDUCATION............. 2
BETTER DISCIPLINE........................ 3 54
SCHOOL IS CLOSER......................... 4
OTHER:________________________ 5

62. CIRCLE ONE (SEE LABEL):

RESPONDENT IS IN CLOSURE SAMPLE..................... 1
RESPONDENT IS IN CONTROL
SAMPLE............................ *GO TO Q. 66*........ 2

63. Were there any children under 5 in your household in (YEAR)?

YES.. 1
55
NO.. 2

64. Were there any children of elementary school age in your household in (YEAR)?

YES.. 1
56
NO..................... *GO TO Q. 66*........ 2

65. Were any of them enrolled in public school in (YEAR)?

YES.. 1
NO.. 2 57
DON'T KNOW.................................. D

66. Does your household (do you) own this house (apartment), are you buying it, or do you rent it?

OWN/BUYING.................................. 1
RENT/LEASE.................................. 2 58
DON'T KNOW.................................. D

67. What was your household's total annual income before taxes last year? You don't have to tell me the exact amount--just the letter of the group on this card that comes closest to it.

A. $0 TO $4,999.............................. 1
B. $5,000 TO $9,999.......................... 2
C. $10,000 TO $11,999........................ 3
D. $12,000 TO $14,999........................ 4
E. $15,000 TO $19,999........................ 5 59
F. $20,000 TO $24,999........................ 6
G. $25,000 TO $49,000........................ 7
H. $50,000 OR MORE........................... 8
DON'T KNOW................................... D
REFUSED...................................... R

68. How much have you been following the news lately about the closure of some of the public elementary schools? Would you say you've followed it:

very closely,................................ 1
somewhat closely,............................ 2
a little bit, or............................. 3 60
not at all................................... 4
DON'T KNOW................................... D

69. My next few questions are only for research purposes. You may feel free not to answer them if you don't want to.

Did you happen to vote in the school levy election on March 16?

YES.. 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q. 71*........ 2 61

REFUSED............. *GO TO Q. 71*........ R

70. How did you vote?

YES.. 1

NO... 2 62

REFUSED.................................... R

71. That ends our interview. Thank you very much for your time. Would you mind giving me your name and phone number in case my supervisor wants to check on my work?

AGREED..................................... 1

63

REFUSED BOTH......... *GO TO Q. 74*........ R

72. NAME: ________________________________

REFUSED.................................... R

73. PHONE: ☐☐☐-☐☐☐☐

REFUSED.................................... R

74. WHAT IS RESPONDENT'S SEX? (DO NOT ASK)

FEMALE.................................. 1

MALE.................................... 2 64

75. WHAT IS RESPONDENT'S RACE? (DO NOT ASK)

AMERICAN INDIAN......................... 1

ASIAN................................... 2

BLACK................................... 3

CHICANO/SPANISH DESCENT................. 4 65

WHITE................................... 5

OTHER:________________________________ 6

DON'T KNOW.............................. D

76. RESPONDENT LIVES IN:

HOUSE................................... 1

2- OR 3-UNIT DWELLING................... 2 66

APARTMENT............................... 3

77. "VISIBLE NEIGHBORHOOD" IS:

RESIDENTIAL............................. 1

MIXED RESIDENTIAL & COMMERCIAL.......... 2 67

*** END OF INTERVIEW ***

TIME ENDED ☐☐:☐☐ AM......1 PM......2

POST CODE: DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL ☐ 68

BUSINESS

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

Mathematica Policy Research
Seattle, Washington

ID NO.	22- 47
TYPE	CLOS/BUS
ATTEND DIST	INTERLAKE
NO. YRS AGO	5
CLOSURE YEAR	1971

ID Number ☐☐ - ☐☐☐ $\frac{1}{6}$
1 2 3 4 5

Address: ______________________________

Interviewer: ______________________ I.D.: __________

Time Began ☐☐ : ☐☐ AM....1 PM....2

COMP. TIME ☐☐☐ MIN.
7 8 9

Hello, my name is________________________, from Mathematica Policy Research. We are conducting a survey for the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public Schools to find out people's opinions about their neighborhoods and about schools and education. Your address was randomly selected to represent the opinions of people in businesses like yours in Seattle. All information will be held confidential and will only be used to produce statistical reports. The interview takes about 10-15 minutes. We would appreciate your help in this study.

1. When did your business open at this location?

19 ☐☐
10 11

2. Why did you choose this neighborhood?

FOUND THE RIGHT PLACE/RIGHT PRICE	1	
NO COMPETITION NEARBY	2	
NEIGHBORHOOD NEEDED THIS TYPE OF BUSINESS	3	12
CLOSE TO SCHOOL	4	
ACCESS TO TRANSPORTATION	5	
ACCESS TO RAW MATERIALS/SUPPLIES	6	
OTHER: ______________________	7	

3. Where do most of your customers come from? Would you say:

from this neighborhood,	1	
from other areas of Seattle, or	2	13
from outside Seattle	3	
DON'T KNOW	D	

4. All in all, how satisfied are you with this neighborhood as a place to do business? Would you say:

very satisfied,	1	
somewhat satisfied,	2	14
somewhat dissatisfied, or	3	
very dissatisfied?	4	

SEE LABEL ON COVER FOR "NUMBER OF YEARS" FOR Q. 5-23. IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN HERE LESS THAN (NUMBER) YEARS, ASK Q.5-23 "since you've been here". IF RESPONDENT HAS BEEN HERE (NUMBER) YEARS OR MORE, ASK Q. 5-23 "over the last (NUMBER) years or so."

5. Overall, what has happened to this neighborhood as a place to do business (over the last (NUMBER) years or so)(since you've been here)? Has it:

improved, ... 1
stayed the same, or 2 15
gotten worse? 3
DON'T KNOW .... D

For the next part of the interview, when I talk about "this area," I mean (SHOW MAP, POINT OUT MAIN STREETS AND LANDMARKS. LOCATE RESPONDENT'S BUSINESS ON MAP.) When you answer the next few questions, please answer only about the area I just showed you. If you think you can't answer for the whole area, it's okay if you answer about just the part you know about. Just don't tell me about anything outside the area on the map.

6. Do most, some, or only a few people in this area keep up their property?

MOST 1
SOME 2 16
FEW 3
DON'T KNOW .... D

7. How much crime is there around here--would you say:

a lot, ... 1
some, ... 2
a little, or 3 17
none? 4
DON'T KNOW .... D

8. Would you say that property values in this area are:

going up faster than those in the city as a whole.. 1
going up at the same rate, ... 2
going up at a slower rate, ... 3
18
not changing, or 4
going down? 5
DON'T KNOW .... D

9. CIRCLE ONE (SEE Q. 1):

BUSINESS HAS BEEN HERE LESS
THAN 2 YEARS.......................*GO TO Q. 16*....... 1

BUSINESS HAS BEEN HERE 2 YEARS OR MORE............. 2

10. Now I'd like to ask how this area might have changed(over the last (NUMBER) of years or so) (since you've been here). Do people in this area keep up their property more, the same or less than the people who lived here (NUMBER) years ago (when you were first here)?

MORE 1
SAME 2
19
LESS 3
DON'T KNOW .... D

11. Is the crime rate in this area higher, about the same, or lower than it was (NUMBER) years ago (when you were first here)?

HIGHER	1	
SAME	2	
LOWER	3	20
DON'T KNOW	D	

12. Has your volume of business increased, stayed the same, or decreased (over the last (NUMBER) years or so)(since you've been here)?

INCREASED	1	
SAME	2	
DECREASED	3	21
DON'T KNOW	D	

13. Is there anything (else) about this neighborhood that you feel has changed over the last (NUMBER) years or so (since you've been here) -- things like the kind of people who live here, the way the land is used, and so on?

YES:

	INCREASED	DECREASED	
AGE OF RESIDENTS................	1	2	22
NUMBER OF MINORITIES...........	1	2	23
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF RESIDENTS........................	1	2	24
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN NEIGHBORHOOD........................	1	2	25
NUMBER OF OWNER-OCCUPIED HOMES.........................	1	2	26
AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL USE OF LAND..............	1	2	27
NUMBER OF MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCES.........................	1	2	28
ACTIVITY OF COMMUNITY GROUPS	1	2	29
COMMUNITY SPIRIT OF RESIDENTS	1	2	30
OTHER: ____________________	1	2	31

NO:.. 1 32

14. CIRCLE ONE:

RESPONDENT MENTIONED AT LEAST ONE CHANGE IN Q. 10-13.. 1

RESPONDENT MENTIONED NO CHANGES.......................... *GO TO Q. 16*........ 2

15. Why do you feel (it) (those things) have changed?

CLOSURE OF SCHOOLS.......................... 1

OTHER(SPECIFY): ____________________ 33

____________________ 2

DON'T KNOW.................................... D

16. SEE LABEL ON COVER FOR "YEAR" FOR Q. 17-25. CIRCLE ONE (SEE Q. 1):

BUSINESS WAS HERE IN (YEAR)...............................1

BUSINESS WAS NOT HERE IN (YEAR). .*GO TO Q. 26*........ 2

17. Has the area become more commercial or industrial, stayed the same, or become less commercial or industrial(over the last (NUMBER) years or so) (since you've been here)?

MORE.. 1

SAME.. 2

LESS.. 3 34

DON'T KNOW.................................. D

18. Have any businesses in the area failed in the last (NUMBER) years or so?

YES... 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q. 22*........ 2 35

DON'T KNOW........... *GO TO Q. 22*........ D

19. How many have failed? ☐☐ 36 37

20. What caused (that)(those) failure(s)?

SCHOOL CLOSURE.......................... 1

OTHER (SPECIFY):______________________ 38

______________________________________ 2

DON'T KNOW.............................. D

21. Has the volume of business (in the area) (of those businesses that are still in the area) increased, stayed the same, or decreased over the last (NUMBER) years or so?

INCREASED............GO TO Q23........1 ...1

SAME.................GO TO Q23........2 ...2 39

DECREASED...........................3 ...3

DON'T KNOW...........GO TO Q23........D ...D

22. WHAT CAUSED IT TO DECREASE

SCHOOL CLOSURE.............1 ...E.................... 1

OTHER.......................

.......................2 ..*GO TO Q. 26*........ 2

DON'T KNOW...................

[illegible]

23. CIRCLE ONE(SEE LABEL)

RESPONDENT IS IN CLOSURE
SAMPLE....................1 1

______________________ 40

RESPONDENT IS IN CONTROL
OR THREATENED CLOSURE
SAMPLE.......GO TO Q26...2 ______________________ 2

.... D

24. You may remember that (NEIGHBORHOOD) school closed in (YEAR). I'd like to ask you a few questions about some effects that might have had on this neighborhood.

Did closing the school cause:

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
people to move out of the neighborhood?	1	2	D	41
property values to go down? ...	1	2	D	42
crime in the neighborhood to increase?	1	2	D	43
people who lived here to show less concern for the neighborhood?	1	2	D	44
people in the community to find a new place to hold meetings?	1	2	D	45
the type of people moving in to change?	1	2	D	46

25. Was being near (NEIGHBORHOOD) school good for your business?

YES..1

NO...2 47

DON'T KNOW................................ D

** GO TO Q. 29 **

26. You may have heard that Seattle Public Schools have closed the elementary schools in some neighborhoods. I'd like to ask you a few questions about some effects closing a school might have on the neighborhood around the school.

Would closing a neighborhood elementary school cause:

	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
people to move out of the neighborhood?	1	2	D	48
property values to go down? ..	1	2	D	49
crime in the neighborhood to increase?	1	2	D	50
people who live here to show less concern for the neighborhood?	1	2	D	51
the type of people moving in to change?	1	2	D	52
the volume of business in the neighborhood to drop?	1	2	D	53
the area to become more industrial or commercial? ...	1	2	D	54

27. Is being near (NEIGHBORHOOD) school good for your business?

YES.. 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q. 29*....... 2 55

DON'T KNOW................................ D

28. If (NEIGHBORHOOD) School closed, do you think your business would move?

YES.. 1
NO..2 56
DON'T KNOW.................................D

29. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about you and your business.

Do you live:

in the area on the map........................ 1
in Seattle, but not in this area, or.............. 2 57
outside Seattle?................................3

30. Including yourself, how many employees do you have? ☐ ☐ ☐
58 59 60

31. What was your business' gross income last year? You don't have to tell me the exact amount--just the letter of the group on this card that comes closest to it.

A. LESS THAN $20,000...................... 1
B. $20,000 - $39,999........................ 2
C. $40,000 - $59,999........................ 3
D. $60,000 - $99,999........................ 4
61
E. $100,000 - $199,999..................... 5
F. OVER $200,000........................... 6
REFUSED.................................... R
DON'T KNOW................................ D

32. That ends our interview. Thank you very much for your time. Would you mind giving me your name and phone number in case my supervisor wants to check on my work?

AGREED.................................... 1

62

REFUSED BOTH.........*GO TO Q. 35*........ R

33. NAME:________________________________

REFUSED.................................... R

34. PHONE: ☐☐☐-☐☐☐☐

REFUSED.................................... R

35. "VISIBLE NEIGHBORHOOD" IS:

COMMERCIAL............................. 1

MIXED RESIDENTIAL & COMMERCIAL........ 2 63

*** END OF INTERVIEW ***

TIME ENDED ☐☐ : ☐☐

AM............................1

PM............................2

POST-CODE:

DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL ☐

64

TRACKED

THE NEIGHBORHOOD SURVEY

Mathematica Policy Research
Seattle, Washington

ID NO.	57- 92
TYPE	TRACKED
ATTEND DIST	
NO. YRS AGO	0
CLOSURE YEAR	

ID Number 57 - 092 1/6
1 2 3 4 5

Address: ______________________________

Interviewer: ______________________ I.D.: __________

Time Began ☐☐ : ☐☐ AM....1 PM....2

COMP. TIME ☐☐☐ MIN.
7 8 9

Hello, my name is ______________________, from Mathematica Policy Research. We are conducting a survey for the City of Seattle and the Seattle Public Schools to find out about why people move, and their opinions about the neighborhoods they live in and their schools. You were selected at random from people who have moved from the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area over the last few years and as such it's important that we get your opinions. All information will be held confidential and will only be used to produce statistical reports. The interview takes about 20 minutes. We would appreciate your help in this study.

●ONLY IF RESPONDENT ASKS WHERE WE GOT HIS(HER) NAME, SAY:

Your name came from a list of people who have moved that was provided by the Seattle Public Schools.

1. When did you first move into this house (apartment)?

19 ☐☐

10 11

2. Why did you choose this neighborhood?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:

WORK-RELATED:

DISTANCE FROM WORK.................... 1 12

OTHER WORK-RELATED.................... 1 13

HOUSING:

STRUCTURE (FOUND RIGHT PLACE)........ 1 14

FINANCIAL 1 15

SCHOOLS:

BETTER................................. 1 16

CLOSER................................. 1 17

NEIGHBORHOOD:

SAFER.................................. 1 18

ACCESS TO SHOPS, PUBLIC FACILITIES..... 1 19

BETTER TRANSPORTATION................ 1 20

VIEW--OTHER GEOGRAPHICAL FEATURES.. 1 21

SIMILAR NEIGHBORS..................... 1 22

NEIGHBORLINESS/COMMUNITY SPIRIT...... 1 23

PERSONAL................................ 1 24

OTHER:______________________________

__________________________________ 1 25

3. We're interested in the kinds of changes in neighborhoods that might cause people to move. Would your household want to move if:

IF "YES" TO ITEM "C" OR "E" ONLY, ASK:

4. Do you think you would actually move if:

	(Q.3) WANT TO MOVE?			(Q.4) IF YES TO 'C' OR 'E': WOULD MOVE?
	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW	
A. the amount of industry nearby increased? 26	1	2	D	
B. more places in the neighborhood were rented out, rather than occupied by their owners? 27	1	2	D	
C. any of the schools in the neighborhoods closed? 28	1	2	D	YES.........1 NO..........2 32 DK......... D
D. the kind of people living in the neighborhood changed? 29	1	2	D	
E. the quality of the schools in the neighborhood decreased? 30	1	2	D	YES..........1 NO.......... 2 33 DK.......... D
F. property values went down?.............. 31	1	2	D	

5. Here is a list of things that may be important in making a neighborhood a good place to live. Do you think (ITEM) is not too important, somewhat important or very important to you?

6. IF MORE THAN 3 "VERY IMPORTANT", ASK, Which of those that were "very important" are the 3 most important to you? Here's a card to remind you of the choices. HAND CARD.

7. IF MORE THAN ONE "MOST IMPORTANT," ASK, Which of those 3 is the single most important to you?

	(Q. 5)			(Q. 6)	(Q. 7)	
	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	3 MOST IMPORTANT	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT	
a. Convenience to shopping........	1	2	3	4	5	34
b. A low crime rate in the area......	1	2	3	4	5	35
c. Neighbors who help each other out.............	1	2	3	4	5	36
d. The quality of schools in the area...........	1	2	3	4	5	37
e. Convenience to work...........	1	2	3	4	5	38
f. Neighbors who are similar to you and your family......	1	2	3	4	5	39
g. Schools that are within walking distance.........	1	2	3	4	5	40
h. Convenience to public transportation...........	1	2	3	4	5	41
i. Convenience to parks and recreation areas......	1	2	3	4	5	42

8. All in all, how satisfied are you with this neighborhood as a place to live? Would you say:

Very satisfied	1	
somewhat satisfied,	2	43
somewhat dissatisfied, or	3	
very dissatisfied?	4	

9. Here is a list of things that might be important in giving elementary school age children a good education. Do you think (ITEM) is not too important, somewhat important, or very important in giving elementary school children a good education?

10. IF MORE THAN THREE "VERY IMPORTANT", ASK: Which of those that were "very important" are the 3 most important to you? Here's a card to remind you of the choices. HAND CARD.

11. IF MORE THAN ONE "MOST IMPORTANT", ASK: Which of those is the most important to you?

	(Q. 9)			(Q. 10)	(Q. 11)	
	NOT TOO IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT	3 MOST IMPORTANT	SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT	
a. Teaching the basic skills......	1	2	3	4	5	44
b. Strict discipline...	1	2	3	4	5	45
c. Attending a school within walking distance from home..	1	2	3	4	5	46
d. Individualized instruction.......	1	2	3	4	5	47
e. A friendly atmosphere in the school	1	2	3	4	5	48
f. Good teachers....	1	3	3	4	5	49

12. All in all, how good a job are the public elementary schools in this neighborhood doing today--would you say:

excellent, ... 1

good, ... 2

fair, or 3 50

poor? 4

DON'T KNOW .... D

** GO TO Q. 14 **

13. Now, thinking about the education the children in this neighborhood receive in the public elementary schools, would you say (ITEM) is excellent, good, fair, or poor? CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH ITEM "a"-"e" ON GRID. IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS DON'T KNOW TO 2 OR MORE ITEMS, OR INDICATES (S)HE DOESN'T KNOW ABOUT SCHOOLS, CIRCLE "D" FOR REMAINING ITEMS, AND GO TO Q. 14.

	EXCEL-LENT	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DON'T KNOW	
a. the subjects they are taught	1	2	3	4	D	51
b. the way they are disciplined...	1	2	3	4	D	52
c. the distance they travel to school..	1	2	3	4	D	53
d. after-school programs that are offered..	1	2	3	4	D	54
e. the quality of the teachers	1	2	3	4	D	55

14. In the last year has any one in your household attended any meetings or other activities that were held in a public elementary school building?

YES.. 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q. 17*........ 2 56

DON'T KNOW .... *GO TO Q. 17*........ D

15. What kinds of activities were these? FOR EACH ASK:

16. Who attended that meeting (activity)--was it adults, junior or senior high school-aged children, or younger children?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:	(Q. 15)	(Q. 16)		
	TYPE	ADULTS	HIGH SCHOOL	YOUNGER CHILDREN
PTSA.........................	1	1 57	1 58	1 59
SCHOOL-RELATED SOCIAL OR FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES......	2	1 60	1 61	1 62
CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCILS, COMMUNITY GROUPS............	3	1 63	1 64	1 65
SCOUTS, CAMPFIRE GIRLS, YOUTH GROUPS................	4	1 66	1 67	1 68
ADULT ED./NIGHT SCHOOL......	5	1 69	1 70	1 71
PARK DEPT., RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.....................	6	1 72	1 73	1 74
PRE-SCHOOL, DAY CARE........	7	1 75	1 76	1 77
RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL ORGS	8	1 78	1 79	1 80
OTHER EDUCATIONAL: ______	9	1 7	1 8	1 9
OTHER MEETINGS: ______	10	10	11	12

Card 2: ☐☐ - ☐☐☐ 1 2 3 4 5 2/6

17. Are there any (other) activities or meetings that you think ought to take place in the public elementary schools.

YES.. 1
13
NO...................... *GO TO Q.19*........ 2

18. What are they?

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:

PTSA.. 1 14

SCHOOL-RELATED SOCIAL OR FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES........................... 1 15

CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCILS, COMMUNITY GROUPS.................................... 1 16

SCOUTS, CAMPFIRE GIRLS, YOUTH GROUPS.. 1 17

ADULT ED./NIGHT SCHOOL.................. 1 18

PARK DEPT., RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.... 1 19

PRE-SCHOOL, DAY CARE..................... 1 20

RELIGIOUS, POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS...... 1 21

OTHER EDUCATIONAL:______________________

____ 1 22

OTHER MEETINGS:_________________________ 1 23

____

** GO TO Q.20 **

19. Should public schools be used for other activities besides educating children?

YES.. 1

NO... 2 24

DON'T KNOW................................. D

20. Now I'm going to be asking you some questions about the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area and why you left it.

Why did you move out of your place in (NEIGHBORHOOD)?

CIRCLE ONLY ONE:

WORK:

DISTANCE............ *GO TO Q.22*........ 1

OTHER
WORK-RELATED...... *GO TO Q.22 *....... 2

HOUSING:

STRUCTURE (LACKED DESIRED
FEATURES).......... *GO TO Q.22 *........ 3

75

FINANCIAL (COULDN'T AFFORD
RENT)................. *GO TO Q. 22*........ 4

SCHOOLS.................................. 5

CHANGE IN
NEIGHBORHOOD........ *GO TO Q. 22*....... 6

PERSONAL............. *GO TO Q. 22*........ 7

OTHER: ________________________________

___________________..... *GO TO Q. 22*........ 8

21. What about the schools didn't you like?

BUSSING	1	26
DISTANCE TO SCHOOL	1	27
CROWDED CLASS ROOMS	1	28
NOT ENOUGH AFTER-SCHOOL ACTIVITIES	1	29
TEACHERS	1	30
CURRICULUM	1	31
(LAST RESORT ONLY): QUALITY OF SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS	1	32
OTHER: ______________________	1	33

22. Thinking about the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area at the time you moved, overall, what was happening to it as a place to live? Was it:

improving	1	
staying the same, or	2	34
getting worse?	3	
DON'T KNOW	D	

23. At the time you moved, was (NEIGHBORHOOD) the kind of area where neighbors helped each other out?

YES	1	
NO	2	35
DON'T KNOW	D	

24. Did most, some, or a few people in the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area keep up their property?

MOST	1	
SOME	2	
FEW	3	36
DON'T KNOW	D	

25. At the time you moved, how often did crimes like vandalism and burglary happen in the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area? Would you say:

a lot.	1	
some, or	2	
a little?	3	37
DON'T KNOW	D	

26. At the time you moved, how many vacant houses were there in the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area? Would you say:

a lot.	1	
some,	2	
a few, or	3	38
none?	4	
DON'T KNOW	D	

27. Were there any (other) ways you thought the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area was changing?

CODE ANY SPECIFIC CHANGES MENTIONED IN Q. 20 HERE.

YES:	INCREASED	DECREASED	
SCHOOLS			
DISTANCE..................	1	2	39
QUALITY..................	1	[illegible]	40
PROPERTY:			
UPKEEP OF PROPERTY...........	1	2	41
PROPERTY VALUES..............	1	2	42
NUMBER OF OWNER-OCCUPIED HOMES.........................	1	2	43
AMOUNT OF COMMERCIAL/ INDUSTRIAL USE OF LAND.......	1	2	44
VACANT HOUSES/APARTMENTS...	1	2	45
NUMBER OF MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCES:..................	1	2	46
RESIDENTS:			
AGE OF RESIDENTS...............	1	2	47
NUMBER OF MINORITIES.........	1	2	48
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS OF RESIDENTS.....................	1	2	49
NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN NEIGHBORHOOD.................	1	2	50
ACTIVITY OF COMMUNITY GROUPS	1	2	51
COMMUNITY SPIRIT/CONCERN OF RESIDENTS.....................	1	2	52
NEIGHBORHOOD:			
CRIME RATE.....................	1	2	53
SHOPS, PUBLIC FACILITIES......	1	2	54
TRANSPORTATION...............	1	2	55
OTHER:______________________	1	2	56

NO:................................ 1 — 57

28. "SCHOOLS" WAS ONLY CHANGE MENTIONED
IN Q. 20 & 27.............................. *GO TO Q.33*........ 1

OTHER CHANGES WERE MENTIONED IN Q. 20 & 27.............. 2

29. What caused (those changes)(that change) in the neighborhood?

SCHOOL CLOSURE....... *GO TO Q. 33*...... 1

OTHER: ____

________________.............................. 2 58

DON'T KNOW.................................... D

29A IS ORIGINAL NEIGHBORHOOD
DECATUR

YES....GO TO Q.33........1
NO.......................2

30. CIRCLE ONE:

RESPONDENT MENTIONED
"SCHOOLS" IN Q. 20 OR 27.. .... *GO TO Q.33*........1

RESPONDENT DID NOT MENTION "SCHOOLS"
IN Q.20 OR 27.. 2

31. Were you aware that (NEIGHBORHOOD) school closed in (YEAR)?

YES... 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q. 33*........ 2 59

32. Did the school closure enter into your decision to move out of (NEIGHBORHOOD)?

YES.. 1

NO... 2 60

DON'T KNOW................................. D

33. When did you move out of the (NEIGHBORHOOD) area--in what month and year?

☐☐ ☐☐

61 MO 62 63 YR 64

34. Now I'd like to ask a few questions about you and your household.

Other than you, how many adults are currently living in your household?

☐☐

65 66

NONE.................. *GO TO Q.36 *...0 0

35. What are the ages of the other adults?

1..... ☐☐ 67 68

2..... ☐☐ 69 70

3..... ☐☐ 71 72

4..... ☐☐ 73 74

5..... ☐☐ 75 76

36. How old are you?

☐☐

77 78

37. Are there any children in your household?

YES.. 1

NO...................... *GO TO Q.45 *....... 2

79

Card 3 ☐☐ - ☐☐☐ 3

1 2 3 4 5 6

33. What are their ages?

1.....	☐ 7	☐ 8
2.....	☐ 9	☐ 10
3.....	☐ 11	☐ 12
4.....	☐ 13	☐ 14
5.....	☐ 15	☐ 16
6.....	☐ 17	☐ 18
7.....	☐ 19	☐ 20
8.....	☐ 21	☐ 22
9.....	☐ 23	☐ 24
10.....	☐ 25	☐ 26

39. ARE THERE ANY CHILDREN AGES 5-12?

YES.. 1

NO.................... *GO TO Q.45*....... 2

40. (Is this child)(Are some or all of the children aged 5-12) enrolled in a public elementary school?

ALL ARE.................................... 1
SOME ARE.................................... 2
NO.................... *GO TO Q. *........ 3 27
DON'T KNOW........... *GO TO Q.42 *....... D

41. (Does he or she)(Do some or all of the children enrolled in public elementary school) attend school in this neighborhood?

ALL DO.................................... 1
SOME DO.................................... 2
NO.................................... 3 28
DON'T KNOW....................................D

42. CIRCLE ONE:

THERE ARE CHILDREN AGED 5-12 WHO ARE NOT IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.......................... 1

THERE ARE NO CHILDREN AGED 5-12 WHO ARE NOT IN PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL... *GO TO Q.45*........ 2

43. Is this child (Are any of these children aged 5-12) enrolled in a private or parochial school?

YES.................................... 1
NO.................... *GO TO Q. 45*........ 2 29
DON'T KNOW...........*GO TO Q. 45*........ D

44. Why is he (she)(are they) enrolled in private school?

CIRCLE ONLY ONE:

WANTED RELIGIOUS EDUCATION............. 1

BETTER ACADEMIC EDUCATION............. 2

BETTER DISCIPLINE....................... 3 30

SCHOOL IS CLOSER....................... 4

OTHER: ______________________________ 5

45. What elementary school attendance district is your home in?

______________________________ 1

31

DON T KNOW................................D

46. Does your household (do you) own this house (apartment), are you buying it, or do you rent it?

OWN/BUYING............................. 1

RENT/LEASE............................. 2 32

DON'T KNOW............................. D

47. What was your household's total annual income before taxes last year? You don't have to tell me the exact amount--just the letter of the group on this card that comes closest to it.

A.	$0 TO $4,999	1
B.	$5,000 TO $9,999	2
C.	$10,000 TO $11,999	3
D.	$12,000 TO $14,999	4
E.	$15,000 TO $19,999	5
F.	$20,000 TO $24,999	6
G.	$25,000 TO $49,000	7
H.	$50,000 OR MORE	8
DON'T KNOW		D
REFUSED		R

33

48. How much have you been following the news lately about the closure of some of the public elementary schools? Would you say you've followed it:

very closely,....................................1

somewhat closely,.............................. 2

a little bit, or.................................. 3 34

not at all.. 4

DON'T KNOW....................................D

49. My next few questions are only for research purposes. You may feel free not to answer them if you don't want to.

Did you happen to vote in the school levy election on March 16?

YES.. 1

NO......................*GO TO Q. 54*......... 2 35

REFUSED.................*GO TO Q. 54*......... R

50. How did you vote?

YES.. 1

NO... 2 36

REFUSED....................................... R

51. That ends our interview. Thank you very much for your time. Would you mind giving me your name and phone number in case my supervisor wants to check on my work?

AGREED. 1
REFUSED BOTH. . . . . *GO TO Q.46 *. . . . . R 37

52. NAME:______________________________________

REFUSED. . . . . R

53. PHONE: ☐☐☐-☐☐☐☐

REFUSED. . . . . R

54. WHAT IS RESPONDENT'S SEX? (DO NOT ASK)

FEMALE.................................. 1
MALE.................................... 2 38

55. WHAT IS RESPONDENT'S RACE? (DO NOT ASK)

AMERICAN INDIAN......................... 1
ASIAN................................... 2
BLACK................................... 3
CHICANO/SPANISH DESCENT................. 4 39
WHITE................................... 5
OTHER: ________________________________ 6
DON'T KNOW.............................. D

56. RESPONDENT LIVES IN:

HOUSE................................... 1
2- OR 3-UNIT DWELLING.................... 2 40
APARTMENT............................... 3

57. "VISIBLE NEIGHBORHOOD" IS:

RESIDENTIAL............................. 1
MIXED RESIDENTIAL & COMMERCIAL.......... 2 41

*** END OF INTERVIEW ***

TIME ENDED ☐☐:☐☐ AM......1 PM......2

POST CODE:
DISTANCE FROM SCHOOL ☐ 42

VALIDATION

Household Survey

Respondent's Name: ____________________

Telephone: ____________

Interview ID#: ____________

Hello, I'm __________ from Mathematica Policy Research.

Did one of our interviewers contact you recently and conduct an interview about your neighborhood?

YES ☐

NO ☐

1. Was the interviewer courteous and professional in their approach?

YES ☐

NO ☐

2. About how long did the interviewer take?

☐☐☐ MIN

3. When did you first move into this house (apartment)?

1 9 ☐☐

(Compare with #1--check if inconsistent ☐)

4. Do you think ______*______ is not too important, somewhat important, or very important in giving elementary school children a good education?

(Check if inconsistent ☐)

* Item listed as single most important on question 31, page 13.

5. How many children are there in your household?

☐☐

(Compare with questions 54 and 55 on page 21 and check if inconsistent ☐).

Thank you very much for your help.

VALIDATORS COMMENTS:

NOTE: Refer any inconsistencies to Mike Wheeler--this form along with the interview booklet.

VALIDATION

Business Survey

Respondent's Name: ____________________________________

Telephone: ____________________

Interview ID#: ____________________

Hello, I'm ________________ from Mathematica Policy Research.

Did one of our interviewers contact you recently and conduct an interview about your neighborhood?

YES ☐

NO ☐

1. Was the interviewer courteous and professional in their approach?

YES ☐

NO ☐

2. About how long did the interviewer take?

☐☐☐ MIN

3. When did your business open at this location?

1 9 ☐☐

(Compare with #1--check if inconsistent ☐)

4. How much crime is there around here--would you say:

a lot,	1
some,	2
a little, or	3
none?	4
DON'T KNOW	D

(Compare with #7 on page 5 and check here if inconsistent ☐)

5. Do you live:

in the (ATTENDANCE) area,	1
in Seattle, but not in this area, or	2
outside Seattle?	3

(Compare with #29 on page 12 and check here if inconsistent ☐)

Thank you for your help.

VALIDATORS COMMENTS:

NOTE: Refer any inconsistencies to Mike Wheeler--this form along with the interview booklet.

4. Do you think ______*______ is not too important, somewhat important, or very important in giving elementary school children a good education?

(Check if inconsistent ☐)

* Item listed as single most important on question 11, page 6.

5. How many children are there in your household?

☐☐

(Compare with questions 37 and 38 on pages 15 and 16 and check if inconsistent ☐).

Thank you very much for your help.

VALIDATORS COMMENTS:

NOTE: Refer any inconsistencies to Mike Wheeler--this form along with the interview booklet.

VALIDATION

Tracked Survey

Respondent's Name: ______________________________

Telephone: ______________

Interview ID#: ______________

Hello, I'm ______________ from Mathematica Policy Research.

Did one of our interviewers contact you recently and conduct an interview about your neighborhood?

YES ☐

NO ☐

1. Was the interviewer courteous and professional in their approach?

YES ☐

NO ☐

2. About how long did the interviewer take?

☐☐☐ MIN

3. When did you first move into this house (apartment)?

1 9 ☐☐

(Compare with #1--check if inconsistent ☐)